

September 3 rd 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

City Comments	Team Response
<b><u>Water and Waste Water: 1. The Basis of Design (BOD) Reports have not been accepted by Water Resources. Please revise to address/respond to the following (and any written comments in the reports):</u></b>	
<u>Sewer (1.A)</u> Detail and discuss what will be done with the existing east-west 8-inch VCP sewer in Camelback Road. Will it be removed and replaced with new 12-inch line?? Whatever option is selected, it cannot be abandoned in place.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Sewer (1.B)</u> As proposed, the City Center will cut off sewer service to the proposed On the Waterfront project (59-DR-2014#2). This is not acceptable without an alternative means of providing a connection. Please provide additional information and description of this to confirm understanding and properly stipulate. Requirements discussed separately on 8/25/2020 include the following:	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Sewer (1.B.1)</u> Developer to pothole the Shoeman Lane sewer line to verify depth and ability for On the Waterfront project to connect.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Sewer (1.B.2)</u> Provide written consent from the On the Waterfront developer/property owner that this will be acceptable. NOTE: Their improvement plans required a revision to route the sewer to the north.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Sewer (1.B.3)</u> Provide written agreement from On the Waterfront and Marquee property owners, or their official representatives, on who will be responsible for revising respective previously approved plans; or otherwise be responsible for necessary and proposed coordination.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.

September 3 rd 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

<u>Sewer (1.B.4)</u> Provide written confirmation from Marquee engineer that the Shoeman Lane sewer can be left in place without conflicting with the proposed design indicating removal of said sewer.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Sewer (1.B.5)</u> Provide revised sewer BOD report for the Collection/City Center to document this coordination/information and describe this plan in the BOD so that the City can stipulate if necessary.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Sewer (1.B.6)</u> The existing public sewer located in an 8-foot Public Utility Easement on the south side of the City Center parcel must remain in place and be active, or be relocated and the existing sewer services reconnected. The western-most parcel to the south of City Center is currently being redeveloped and is connecting to this sewer. As proposed, it appears the City Center will be built over the top of the sewer on parcels 173-41-005 and 173-41-004.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Water (C)</u> As proposed, the City Center design creates a long dead-end 8-inch line, which is not acceptable. Please restore existing loop system. Refer to Section 6-1.402 of the DSPM.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Water (C.1)</u> As proposed, the City Center design appears to tap service and fire lines into a large transmission line. This is not permitted. A smaller public water line must be utilized (the existing building has this). Refer to Sections 6-1.416 and 6-1.505 of the DSPM.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.

September 3 rd 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

<u>Water (C.2)</u> For the Mint site, install a tee for existing line and services, and extend 8-inch line to the end of the site and cap. Water for this site should eventually loop to the line on Buckboard Trail.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Water (C.3)</u> Demand peaking factor for restaurants should be between 5 and 6.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<u>Water (C.4)</u> NOTE: Fire flow needs to be assigned at a minimum for high-rise structures as 2,500 gpm. If not a high-rise, evaluate per IFC Appendix and IBC construction type and provide a determination of fire flow for a structure with sprinklers. Compare with DSPM minimum fire flows and use larger of two values. This information shall be provided in the final BOD with the DRB submittal.	Water and sewer BODs approved as noted by Levi prior to this submittal.
<b><u>Drainage: 2.</u> The preliminary drainage report has not been accepted. Please revise to address/respond to the following (and any written comments in the report):</b>	
<u>Drainage (2.A)</u> Provide storm water storage calculations (pre- vs. post-development or first flush, minus true rooftop), whichever is greater. Calculations provided in 2nd submittal report are incorrect. Per the DSPM, volume must be calculated based on the area of disturbance (minus true rooftop). First flush was only calculated for areas with vehicular access.	First flush calculations were revised based on discussion with reviewer. First flush calculation area was revised to represent the disturbed area minus the true roof top. Cwt exhibits were revised to illustrate disturbed area as well as true roof top area. The required volumes were determined to be the following: City Center: pre vs. post, match existing retention    The Mint: pre vs. post is required Maya Hotel: Cwt stayed the same, site is 0.67 ac, no retention is required
<u>Drainage (2.B)</u> FLO-2D exhibits provided in 2nd submittal report were blank. Revise accordingly.	Files size has been reduced, Flo-2D maps should be clear now.
<b><u>Parking Master Plan (PMP): 3.</u> The PMP has not been accepted. Please refer to the following analysis for comments and revise accordingly</b>	

September 3<sup>rd</sup> 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

<p><u>Parking (3.A)</u> Zoning Ordinance required parking:</p> <p><b>Parcel A (City Center)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Option 1                      544 Parking Spaces</li><li>o Option 2                      490</li><li>o Option 3                      695.2</li></ul> <p><b>Parcel B (Mint)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Option 1                      171.7</li><li>o Option 2                      225</li></ul> <p><b>Parcel C (Maya Hotel)</b>      200</p> <p>Total required parking ranging from 862 to 1120 parking spaces</p>	<p>Lohaki to respond with updated PMP - pending per discussion with City Staff.</p>
<p><u>Parking (3.B)</u> The multi-family ratio is greater than the ordinance requirement and, as such, may be appropriate to accommodate guest parking; however, additional guest parking should be provided, considering the existing parking issues in the Old Town area.</p>	<p>Lohaki to respond with updated PMP - pending per discussion with City Staff.</p>
<p><u>Parking (3.C)</u> The proposed hotel requirement (0.65 spaces per key) represents a reduction of 52% from the standard ordinance requirement. This is less than the ratio (0.8 spaces per key) approved for other hotels in the Old Town area (Canopy and DC Hotel). Parking for the Maya Hotel should be 0.8 to match previous approvals.</p>	<p>Lohaki to respond with updated PMP - pending per discussion with City Staff.</p>
<p><u>Parking (3.D)</u> The mixed-use ratio is consistent with the ordinance requirement; however, the PMP only assumes 50% restaurant and 50% retail. PMP should acknowledge and include in analysis the possibility of future bar uses.</p>	<p>Lohaki to Respond with updated PMP - pending per discussion with City Staff.</p>

September 3 rd 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

<p><u>Parking (3.E)</u> The remote parking agreement proposes to utilize 104 spaces on the W Hotel site. The W Hotel has 243 guest rooms and 218 parking spaces, which already represents a reduction to the ordinance requirement. As proposed, the W Hotel does not appear to have enough parking to accommodate both the W and the Maya Hotel.</p>	<p>Lohaki to respond with updated PMP - pending per discussion with City Staff.</p>
<p><u>Parking (3.F)</u> The zoning request now includes a request to preserve existing P-3 credits. As proposed (846 spaces), the PMP relies heavily on the P-3 credits to meet the parking requirement and 100%remote parking (valet) for the Maya Hotel. This seems unrealistic, given the existing parking issues in this area of Old Town.</p>	<p>Lohaki to respond with updated PMP - pending per discussion with City Staff.</p>
<p><u>Parking (3.G)</u> Use of a Shared Parking Analysis in this area of Old Town, given existing parking issues, may not be supported. Dwelling units should be fully parked 24 hours a day.</p>	<p>Lohaki to respond with updated PMP - pending per discussion with City Staff.</p>
<p><b><u>Building Design:</u></b></p>	
<p><u>Building Design (4)</u> From 1st review, the development plan (DP) proposes to significantly reduce the building setback along Camelback Road from the standard requirement of 40 feet down to as little as 20 feet from street curb. Most properties along Camelback Road in this area provide at least a 25-foot setback from the curb line. Additionally, when reviewed in tandem with the height of the proposed building(s), the proposed setback of 20 feet would place the building(s) in a location that would appear much closer than other buildings with a similar setback, but a lower building height (building height to street width). Please revise the DP to provide an increased setback along Camelback Road. Refer to the Old Town Scottsdale Urban Design and Architectural Guidelines (OTSUDAG).</p>	<p>Building setback along Camelback, east of Saddlebag Trail has been increased to 25'. Additionally, the eastern 100' of the Mint parcel will have an additional 30' stepback after the first 50'. These changes will assure of reduced apparent massing of the building along the portion of the property most exposed to the downtown perimeter.</p>

September 3 rd 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

Building Design (5) The DP proposes to amend the building stepback requirement from the Old Town boundary at the Mint site. The proposed amendment encroaches significantly into the standard requirement. Please revise the DP to reduce the proposed encroachment to minimize the potential impact on other properties in the area. Refer to the OTSUDAG.

The building stepback plane has been increased. The eastern 100' of the Mint parcel will have an additional 30' stepback after the first 50'. These changes will assure of reduced apparent massing of the building along the portion of the property most exposed to the downtown perimeter.

Building Design (6) The DP proposes a significant amendment to the standard stepback requirement at the Maya Hotel site; particularly at the south side of the building along Shoeman Lane where the building is located right at the setback line and does not provide any stepback. This amendment differs significantly from the standard requirement and from the guidelines in the OTSUDAG. Please revise the proposed building design for the Maya Hotel to provide additional stepbacks.

Per discussions with City Staff adjustments have been made. See supplemental materials for Maya Hotel.

Building Design (7) For the Maya Hotel, the proposal includes a significant amount of glazing for the facades. The City's Sensitive Design Principles encourage desert-appropriate responses to materials and building design. Please revise the building elevations to reduce the amount of glazing on the east, south and west elevations and incorporate shading over glazing on those elevations.

Per discussions with City Staff adjustments have been made. See supplemental materials for Maya Hotel.

**Circulation : 8. It appears few changes were made from the 1st submittal to the resubmittal. Please refer to 1st review comments letter for comments in addition to those included in this letter. Significant comments not addressed include the following:**

September 3 rd 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

Circulation (8.A) Provide an east-bound deceleration lane on Camelback Road at Brown Avenue. Refer to Section 5- 3.206 of the DSPM.

Deceleration lane has been added to all plans and exhibits.

Circulation (8.B) Due to the high left-turn volume, proximity to the Scottsdale Road intersection and reasonable alternative means of access (Shoeman lane to Scottsdale Road), revise site plan and circulation plan to restrict northbound left-turn movement at the intersection of Camelback & Brown.

Per conversation with staff, it was agreed that movement limitations could be enforced during prime business/traffic hours.

Circulation (9) The 2nd submittal circulation plan still indicates a minimum 5-foot wide sidewalk along “internal block” streets. These are considered public local streets and as such, sidewalk connections on private property should be minimum 6 feet in width unless there are valid constraints. Refer to Section 5-3.110 of the DSPM.

Pedestrian Circulation plan sheet A116 notation has been changed per staff's suggestino of 6'.

Circulation (10) Please revise the circulation plan to indicate Sight Distance Triangles at all public street intersections. Current plan only shows them at a few intersections. Refer to Section 5-3.123 of the DSPM.

Triangles have been added to all intersections on the Vehicular Circulation plan sheet A117

September 3 rd 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

Circulation (11) The 2nd submittal site plan indicates a crosswalk on Scottsdale Road just south of Shoeman Lane, with enhanced paving. Please provide more information and details about what traffic control measures are proposed for this crossing. Enhanced paving will require approval from the Public Works Director and a development agreement for maintenance. This also applies to the enhanced paving treatments proposed at internal intersections.

Agreed, additional notes have been added to the pedestrian circulation plan but these enhancements will still need future coordination with city staff to ensure compliance and coordination with Public Works.

Circulation (12) The 2nd review site plan indicates a new driveway on Scottsdale Road, north of Shoeman. Please demonstrate the minimum 250-foot spacing requirement for driveways on major collector streets.

Done. There is no driveway on Scottsdale Rd. Site plans revised to correct any confusion.

**Engineering:**

Engineering (13) The 2nd submittal Refuse Plan does not indicate a refuse collection point for the future Phase 4. At a minimum, a note should be added to the Refuse Plan indicating that, although no conceptual refuse area is presently shown for Phase 4, refuse collection shall be provided as part of Phase 4 and will be located in Phase 4. Refer to Section 201.309 of the DSPM.

Notation has been added to Refuse Plan sheet A118

**Technical Corrections:** The following technical ordinance or policy related corrections have been identified in the second review. 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:



September 3 rd 2020  
RE: 9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020  
The Scottsdale Collection 73Q42 (Key Code)

<u>Technical Corrections (14)</u> Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate two new transit stops on Camelback at the locations shown on the following graphic. Refer to Sections 5-6.000 and 5-6.100 of the DSPM and City standard details 2263-1 and 2268 for design specifications.	<a href="#">New locations have been added to Vehicular Circulation sheet A117</a>
<u>Technical Corrections (15)</u> Please add the following notes to the circulation plan: (15.A) All alleys affected by this proposal to be repaved and include positive drainage along the alley (Section 3-1.701 of the DSPM).	<a href="#">New notes have been added to Vehicular Circulation sheet A117</a>
<u>Technical Corrections (15.B)</u> Please add the following notes to the circulation plan: Alley connections to streets to be reconstructed to include an ADA accessible pedestrian crossing (Section 3-1.701 of the DSPM).	<a href="#">New notes have been added to Vehicular Circulation sheet A117</a>
<u>Technical Corrections (15.C)</u> Construction work in alleys to be coordinated with Solid Waste to avoid disruptions in service (Section 5-2.616 of the DSPM).	<a href="#">New notes have been added to Vehicular Circulation sheet A117</a>
<u>Technical Corrections (15.D)</u> All non-ADA compliant pedestrian ramps abutting the project site are to be reconstructed(Section 5-8.205 pf the DSPM).	<a href="#">New notes have been added to Vehicular Circulation sheet A117</a>
<u>Technical Corrections (16)</u> From 1st review, a minimum 20-foot wide alley dedication will be required, as shown on the following graphic. Please update applicable plans accordingly if existing alleys are to remain in place. Refer to Section 47-10 of the Scottsdale Revised Code and Section 2-1.601 of the DSPM.	<a href="#">Vehicular Circulation sheet A117 has been revised to show the dedication of this properties 10' portion of the alley dedication.</a>