

BISHOP LANE

(79-ZN-2019)

Response to 1st Review Comments

Responses are provided in **RED** below

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.		
Zoning:		
No.	Task	Responsibility
1.	Please revise the "Site Plan" exhibit to also identify the maximum building height including all rooftop appurtenances, in accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Table 6.1310.C.	TAI
	Response: The maximum building heights, including all rooftop appurtenances per Zoning Ordinance Table 6.1310.C, have been noted within the Site Plan exhibit's Data block per your request. (See sheets 4 and 6)	
2.	Please revise the "Site Sections" and "Elevations" to identify the maximum height of the building, including the rooftop appurtenances, demonstrating compliance with Zoning Ordinance Table 6.1310.C.	TAI
	Response: The maximum building heights, including all rooftop appurtenances per Zoning Ordinance Table 6.1310.C, have been dimensioned on the Sections and Building Elevations per your request. (See sheet 6)	
3.	Please review the "Site Sections" to include the required setback from back of curb, and label the inclined setback ratios and heights, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Sections 6.1308.D and 6.1308.E.	TAI
	Response: The required setback from back of curb as well as the inclined setback ratios and heights have all been noted on the Site Sections and Building Elevations. (See sheet 6)	

A R C H I T E C T U R E P L A N N I N G L A N D S C A P E A R C H I T E C T U R E

4019 N. 44th Street • Phoenix, AZ 85018 • (602) 952-8280 p • (602) 952-8995 f • www.toddassoc.com w
M:\Morgan Group, Inc\SWC 2nd Street & Bishop Lane\03 - 1st Comments and Response\2019.09.13 - Response to 1st Review Comments - v4 - Bishop.docx

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
4.	<p>Please provide roof plan worksheet identifying any portions of the building that exceed 90 feet in height, and demonstrating compliance with the rooftop appurtenance allowance in Zoning Ordinance Table 6.1310.C.</p> <p>Response: A Roof Plan exhibit has been provided that demonstrates compliance with the rooftop appurtenance allowance granted in Table 6.1310.C. (See sheet 20)</p>	TAI
5.	<p>Please revise the Project Narrative (p. 21 of 26) Criteria #3 to include the criteria title “Criteria to Achieve Bonus(es)”, and include discussion within the response to include the requested increase in building height and density and the bonus contribution calculations, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Sections 6.1304.B.3 and 7.1200.D.</p> <p>Response: The narrative has been updated to specifically include this title and response.</p>	WM
6.	<p>Please revise the Project Narrative (p. 23 of 26) “Cultural Improvement Program” to include discussion of the minimum contribution amount of 1% of the building valuation, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1309.</p> <p>Response: The narrative has been updated. The specifics of any artwork and the location thereof are still being evaluated, however it is clear the applicant will participate either in lieu or through the public art process.</p>	WM
7.	<p>Please revise the Project Narrative (p. 25 of 26) include the amount of bonus building height requested in the formula, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 7.1200.D.</p> <p>Response: The narrative has been updated to note eleven (11’) feet of bonus height being requested</p>	WM
8.	<p>Please review the “Site Plan” to show the location of bike parking on the site, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 9.103 and the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2.1-308.</p> <p>Response:</p>	TAI

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	<p>The required number of 2'x6' Bicycle Spaces (10% of the parking stalls) equals 25. These have now been distributed between three locations within the site. There are several bike spaces along the Bishop Lane frontage; more toward the front of the garage along the west side; and the remainder at the back of the garage adjacent to the alley. (See sheet 4)</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Please review the legislative draft of amended development standards per the redlined exhibit included as Attachment #1, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1308.D and 6.1308.D.</p> <p>Response: The legislative draft has been updated to reflect the redlined exhibit and the updated project. Height and density are still the only standards being amended.</p>	<p>WM</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1304.A.3, please revise the project narrative as identified below:</p> <p>A. The Development Plan shall reflect the goals and policies of the Character & Design Chapter of the Old Town Scottsdale Character Area Plan;</p> <p>i. Please revise the Project Narrative and Development Plan so that it also includes an explanation on how the proposed zoning district map amendment will be consistent with the Old Town Scottsdale Character Area Plan, Character and Design Chapter: GoalCD1 – Policies 1.3 and 1.4; Goal CD 3 – Policies 3.4 and 3.5; Goal CD 4 – Policy 4.4; Goal 5 – Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5; Goal CD 6 – Policies 6.2 and 6.5; Goal CD 8 – Policies 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3; Goal 9 – Policies 9.1 and 9.4; Goal CD 10.1, 10.4, 10.5, 10.8 and 10.9; Goal CD 11 – Policies 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4.</p> <p>Response: CD Policy 1.3 pertains to property within the Historic Old Town District (which this property is not). CD Policy 9.1 pertains to civic building. CD Policy 10.1 pertains to City owned facilities</p> <p>Otherwise, the narrative and development plan have been updated to respond to the above listed goals and policies.</p>	<p>WM</p>

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	<p>B. The site development standards and building form shall be in conformance with the Old Town Scottsdale Urban Design & Architectural Guidelines;</p> <p>i. Please revise the Project Narrative and Development Plan so that it also includes an explanation on how the proposed zoning district map amendment will be consistent with the Old Town Urban Design and Architectural Guidelines (OTSUDAG). The submitted Development Plan includes information regarding only a few guidelines that are within the OTSUDAG. The Project Narrative and Development Plan shall provide a comprehensive explanation on how the proposed zoning district map amendment will be in conformance with the OTSUDAG.</p> <p>Response: The Narrative (see Section 4) and the overall project have been updated to more clearly reflect consistency with the OTSUDAG</p>	<p>TAI</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Please indicate the location and method of screening for all above ground mechanical and utility equipment. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirement for Development Applications. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 7.105 and 7.200.B.</p> <p>Response: The ground level mechanical and utility equipment include: the Emergency Generator, the Water Pump, and the Electrical Transformers. Both the generator and pump will be located near the southwest corner of the project and will be screened with building walls. The transformers, however, must maintain a minimum clearance zone as required by the electrical company. All rooftop mechanical equipment will be screened by the surrounding parapet wall (whose top is placed at 87'-0" A.F.F. -below the maximum allowable building height).</p>	<p>TAI</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>Please provide floor plans for all levels of the garage structure, with dimensional information and notations on the floor plan in conformance with Zoning Ordinance Section 9.106.A.</p> <p>Response: Floor plans of each garage level have been provided. They include dimensioning and notation that verify conformance</p>	<p>TAI</p>

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	with Zoning Ordinance Section 9.106.A. (See Sheets 7 and 8)	
13.	Based upon the mature size of the proposed plants, modify the planting density and layout so that it is representative of the mature size of the proposed species, relative to the planting area. In general, a twenty to thirty percent (20 – 30%) reduction of planting intensity should be implemented in order to avoid overcrowding of plants, and so that there will be no need to trim excessively or shear the plants, resulting in sustainable landscape improvements.	ND
	Response: Noted. Plant density has been reduced.	
14.	Please provide typical floor plans for each unit type within the development to illustrate the layout, floor areas, and required private outdoor living areas, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1308.C.	TAI
	Response: Typical Floor Plans have been provided that verify conformance with Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1308.C including required private outdoor living areas. (See sheets 21 and 22)	

Drainage:		
15.	Please evaluate and address the below comments on the preliminary grading & drainage plan with the Development Review Board submitted:	KH
	C. Provide enough existing and proposed grade elevations in order to demonstrate that Stormwater runoff will not flow into the underground garage.	
	Response: Spot tags and flow arrows added to the preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan showing grade breaks adjacent to garage entrances. Storm water runoff from adjacent streets is designed to bypass the garage entrances.	
	D. Per the DSPM, include a table with the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (Firm) information and Engineer's certification (Figures 1-3.11 and 1-3.12).	KH
	Response: Noted, shown on preliminary G&D plan.	

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility

Water and Waste Water:		
16.	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.	KH
	Response: Noted	

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.

Amended Standards:		
17.	Although the Planned Block Development overlay allows a property owner to request increases in building height and/or density, the City Council action is discretionary, and approval is not guaranteed. The requested increase in density (130 du/ac) is substantial, with more than twice the density of any other development in Scottsdale. Requests for amended development standards should be appropriate for the development context, provide public benefits, and improve the quality of life in the community. Please demonstrate how the request is appropriate for the context of the area, and the accompanying benefit that offsets the largest density request the City has ever received.	MG/WM
	Response: The narrative and development plan have been updated to more clearly reflect how the project is appropriate for the development context and provides accompanying public benefits. This is discussed throughout the document and particularly in Section 7 regarding the proposed development standards. It should be noted, the only amended development standards being requested are height and density, for which the ordinance provides a clear, formulaic manner of achieving. No amendments are being sought for those	

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	standards which are commonly adjusted for downtown, infill development projects (i.e. setbacks, stepbacks, building articulations, etc.). The design team has worked diligently to deliver a project which fits entirely within the City's ordinance requirements for building envelope and design guidelines.	
General Plan/Old Town Scottsdale Character Area Plan/Old Town Urban Design and Architectural Guidelines:		
18.	<p>The General Plan Open Space and Recreation Element (Goals 1 and 5) emphasizes the need to improve Scottsdale's urban environments through the addition of meaningful open space for area residents as an important part of the community's overall quality of life. The Old Town Scottsdale Character Area Plan (OTSCAP) highlights the need to further establish the open space network throughout the downtown area (Character & Design Chapter, Goal CD 5, Policies CD 5.1, CD 5.2, CD 5.3, and CD 5.5; and the Old Town Public Spaces and Connectivity Master Plan). In addition, in terms of site design, the Old Town Urban Design and Architectural Guidelines (OTUDAG) provide direction regarding open space areas in Old Town, and how landscaped open spaces can be incorporated into a development site while connecting with the surrounding context (Primary Guidelines 3 and 4). The requested increase in density (130 du/ac) is substantial, however, the submitted Development Plan does not appear to address or provide meaningful open space at the ground level, which if implemented would benefit future residents of the development site as well as the surrounding context. The provision of ground floor public open space is commensurate with requests for additional height and density, particularly of a project with a request of this magnitude. Please revise the site plan, landscape plan and associated exhibits within the Development Plan to provide ground floor public open space along Bishop and/or 2nd Street streetscapes</p>	ND
	<p>Response: Meaningful open space has been provided along both Bishop and 2nd Street through the use of benches, wide, detached sidewalks, bike parking, and ample shade provided by trees and a shade structure. The General Plan notes the need for smaller, intimate open space. This is especially found along 2nd street with new, custom seating area and landscaping in close proximity to the water feature. This area is available for tenants and the public alike.</p>	

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
19.	<p>The OTSCAP places importance on the character created by new building design, and how it may address adjacent development and be architecturally interesting (Character & Design Chapter, Goals CD 1 and CD 9). Furthermore, the OTUDAG encourages building design that both complements the existing development context and reduces apparent building size and mass (Primary Guidelines 12 and 13). With a resubmittal, address the following:</p> <p>A. The Development Plan, as submitted, provides a strong building base at the hard, northeast corner of the subject site where the resident clubhouse is proposed to be located. The remainder of the building, particularly the frontage on Bishop Lane, appears to lack a strong building base, instead matching the middle section of the building design. The base of a building should have the most visual weight, anchoring the building to the ground plane and generating pedestrian interest both from a use and architectural standpoint. Please provide updated design details that more appropriately convey a strong, pronounced base along the Bishop Lane frontage.</p> <p>B. Page 18 and 22 of the narrative state that “Physical and visual access points are provided every 100 – 300 feet in order to further subdivide the building mass”; however, the Development Plan depicts a 360’ building frontage along Bishop Lane with no apparent visual or physical access points, other than access into individual dwelling units. Please provide visual and/or physical breaks in the building design, which should be attainable, given the multiple proposed elevators. For example, a physical break occurring ±160’ south of 2nd Street back-of-curb would align with the development pattern and interaction between the La Loma 5 and the Bespoke Inn developments, west of the subject site. Subdividing the building mass at regular vertical intervals that an elongated development pattern is physically and visually segmented, reducing the apparent building size and mass, as well as creating interaction between various development sites.</p>	<p>TAI/MG</p>
	<p>Response: A) A strong architectural building base (predicated on the original base at the project’s northeast corner) has been extended all along the Bishop Lane frontage and Second</p>	

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	<p>Street frontages. The building now portrays a strong and pronounced visual weight throughout the its length.</p> <p>B) The building mass has now been broken up in several key locations along Bishop Lane. For instance, the building elevation provides a full height recess above the main vehicular entrance by turning down and extending the upper projected shade elements to the first level (along each side of the entry). Also, a pedestrian entry near the south end of the building has been highlighted and enhanced by placing a similar projected element above and adjacent to the doorway. There have been additional enhancements on the building to insure a physically and visually segmented elevation. The west (alley) elevation has also been revised to incorporate a similar building break as on the east (Bishop Lane) elevation.</p>	
20.	<p>The OTSCAP designates 2nd Street as a Pedestrian Place (pages 32 and 33 of the OTSCAP), where streets are expected to include buildings that “face and embrace the pedestrian realm” as well as incorporate sidewalks separated from vehicular traffic and that accommodate “the highest levels of use”. Furthermore, both the OTSCAP Pedestrian Place designation and the OUTDAG (Supporting Guidelines 1.2, 16.5 and Figure 23) discuss the importance of the use of shaded, covered walkways for the pedestrian. With a resubmittal, please provide an 8-foot –wide sidewalk closer to the building frontage along 2nd Street, separated from back-of-curb by landscaping. In addition, please provide a shaded pedestrian environment along 2nd Street – either through the provision of ample tree shading, an integrated cantilevered awning along the same building frontage, or the combination of both. This would push pedestrian activity adjacent to the proposed building and create a safe, shaded pedestrian realm expected of developments along 2nd Street. Consider providing regularly spaced sidewalk interruptions through the landscape area to allow those utilizing parallel parking along 2nd Street to get to the sidewalk.</p> <p>Response: 8’ min. detached sidewalk with interruptions through landscape provided along 2nd Street as well as a cantilevered shade structure and street trees.</p>	ND

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
21.	<p>The General Plan (Character & Design Element, Goal 4, Bullet 13 and Goal 6, Bullet 6) and the OTSCAP (Character & Design Policy CD 7.2) emphasize the importance of mature trees and their placement within the built environment. Furthermore, OTUDAG Supporting Guideline 6.2 states that mature size and maintenance requirements should be considered when planting vegetation within Old Town. The proposal appears to include street trees planted over below-grade parking on both Bishop Lane and 2nd Street Frontages (Development Plan Site Sections). It has been noted that large street trees have difficulty surviving in confined planters, particularly those that do not allow the taproot to naturally extend downward, in this case, because of below-grade parking structures. Street trees should be planted to accommodate proper maturation. Please alter the Landscape Plan and associated exhibits, locating street trees outside of the dimensions of the underground parking structure. This would allow for proper tree maturation as well as accommodate staff's comments concerning the separation of sidewalks from back-of-curb.</p> <p>Response: All street trees along Bishop and 2nd Street are now planted at grade and outside the dimensions of the below grade parking structure.</p>	ND
22.	<p>The subject site is within a 2001 General Plan-designated, Growth Area. As such, please respond to General Plan (Growth Area Element Goal 1, bullet 3), OTSCAP (Character & Design Chapter Policy CD 11.3), and OTUDAG (Primary Guideline 9) related to undergrounding and minimizing the visual impacts of utility equipment within Old Town. The subject site is adjacent to powerlines on the western edge of the property. Please underground the powerlines in conjunction with the development request as this would benefit the development site and adjacent properties.</p> <p>Response: Noted. We will comply.</p>	KH
23.	<p>As a response to Goal 1 of the Community Involvement Element, please provide an updated Citizen Involvement Report that describes the key issues that have been identified through the public involvement process since the first submittal.</p> <p>Response:</p>	WM

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	An updated Citizen Involvement Report has been completed and included in this resubmittal.	
24.	<p>Please revise the Project Narrative and Development Plan so that is also includes an explanation on how the proposed zoning district map amendment will be consistent with the Scottsdale General Plan Character and Design Element: Goal 1 – Bullet 2, 3, and 4; Goal 2 – Bullet 2, 3, 5 and 6; Goal 4 – Bullets 3, 7, 13, 14, 15 and 16; Goal 5 – Bullet 11 and 12; Goal 6 – Bullets 1-6; Goal 7 – Bullets 2-5.</p> <p>Response: Goal 1 Bullet 4 was already included in the narrative. Goal 4 Bullet 3 pertains to Suburban areas. Other applicable Goals have been incorporated into the Narrative and Development Plan.</p>	WM
Site Design:		
32.	<p>Please provide the following information regarding provision of refuse for the development, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 2-1.309.</p> <p>A. Compactors may be used as an alternative to refuse or recycling containers. To determine adequacy + site location of compactors, if proposed, please provide the following on a site/refuse plan, compactor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Type 2. Capacity – state on site plan compactor capacity conversion equating to requirements provided above. 3. Location: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Place the refuse compactor container and approach pad so that the refuse truck route to and from the public street has a minimum unobstructed vertical clearance of thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches (fourteen 14 feet is recommended), and unobstructed minimum vertical clearance above the concrete approach slab and refuse compactor container storage area concrete slab of twenty-five (25) feet.. ii. Place the refuse compactor container in a location that does not require the bin to be maneuvered or relocated from the bin’s storage location to be loaded on to the refuse truck. iii. Provide a refuse compactor container approach area that has a minimum width of fourteen (14) 	TAI

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	<p>feet and length of sixty (60) feet in front of the container.</p> <p>iv. Demonstrate path of travel for refuse truck accommodates a minimum vehicle turning radius 45' and vehicle length of 40'.</p> <p>Response: Waste Management can provide waste and recycle service to this site (see included letter). Based on the 199 units they estimate 1.50 cubic yard of trash and .50 cubic yards of recycle per month per unit based on the state guidelines. This will be approximately 398 yards of service a month (298 trash and 100 recycle). Using a 3 yd. Minimac unit for the trash and the recycle they would request a total of 4 trash bins and 3 recycle bins. They would service the trash bins 3-3 yd. compacted bins 3 times a week (350yds a month as an overestimate) and 2-3 yd. compacted recycle bins 2 times week (155yds per month). This is the estimate once fully occupied. This is an overestimate at 500yds per month so that more service can be accommodated if generated. Waste Management's trucks can service the bins with the drive indicated in the site plan.</p>	

CONSIDERATIONS:		
<p>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.</p>		
Parking:		
<p>33.</p>	<p>Parking requirements in the Downtown area, particularly for multi-family residential developments near Main Street west of Scottsdale Road, have recently been called into question by area property owners, and has been given more consideration by some Councilmembers and Planning Commissioners. There have been suggestions that the City's Ordinance requirements for multi-family residential uses do not provide sufficient number of spaces to accommodate guests and do not consider the high probability that multiple occupants, with cars may be living in units that have 1 bedroom or less. Please consider providing additional parking on-site (beyond the extra 15 spaces</p>	<p>MG/TAI</p>

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	<p>already provided) to accommodate parking for guests and higher occupancy units within the development.</p> <p>In addition, please provide examples of other similar developments you have been involved with that have provided parking at the proposed rate and have been successful.</p> <p>Response: The current garage layout and site plan provides an additional 15 spaces beyond the minimum quantity required by the zoning ordinance. (Refer to the parking level plans on sheets 7 and 8.) The project also proposes a redevelopment of the existing on-street parking spaces to increase the number of available on-site spaces and to do so in a more attractive manner (see plans provided). It is important to note that even the most successful rental communities are not at 100% occupancy. An exception occupancy rate of 95% still provides 10 or so unoccupied units and corresponding parking spaces. As a seasoned multifamily developer, the last thing Morgan would want to do is invest substantially in such a venture and not appropriately park it to their operational needs.</p>	
34.	<p>The existing on-street parking along N. Bishop Lane and E. 2nd Street is parallel. To increase the amount of public parking in the area for the benefit of the general public, as well as this development, please consider moving the curb line back closer to the building and reconfiguring the on-street parking spaces to angle. This may result in approximately 16 additional on-street public parking spaces.</p> <p>Response: The on-street parking has been revised to include diagonal parking, which increases the parking count along the street frontage. Not only would the parking count be increased, but this reconfiguration allows the street trees to be positioned to create a shaded pedestrian pathway along 2nd Street and Bishop Lane. When modified, there will be a total of 20 on-street parking spaces. Three spaces on 2nd street and 17 spaces on Bishop lane.</p>	TAI

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS:

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
<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.</p>		
<p>Site:</p>		
<p>35.</p>	<p>Please revise the site plan and grading and drainage plans to identify the following right-of-way and easement dedications:</p> <p>A. Dedicate an additional 2 feet of right-of-way along the commercial alley site frontage, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.800.</p> <p>B. Dedicate an additional 5 feet of right-of-way along the 2nd Street site frontage, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.100.</p> <p>C. Dedicate an additional 5 feet of right-of-way along the Bishop Lane site frontage, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.100.</p> <p>D. Identify sight distance requirements at the driveway intersection on Bishop Lane. Dedicate a sight distance easement over any portions of the sight lines that extend onto the site, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.123; Figs. And 5-3.26.</p> <p>Response: Noted. We will comply.</p>	<p>KH</p>
<p>36.</p>	<p>Please revise the site plan and grading and drainage plans to identify the following off-site improvements:</p> <p>A. The alley connection to the street shall be reconstructed with to include an ADA accessible pedestrian crossing, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 3-1.701.</p> <p>B. Repave N. Bishop Lane along property frontage to centerline, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-2.612.</p> <p>C. Construction work in the alley shall be coordinated with solid waste, in accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-2.616. A mitigation plan shall be submitted and approved by Solid Waste addressing any disruption to service routes, prior to any permit issuance. Please add a note to site plan accordingly.</p> <p>D. All non-ADA compliant pedestrian ramps abutting project shall be reconstructed with construction of the project, in</p>	<p>MG/KH</p>

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	<p>accordance with the Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-8.205.</p> <p>Response: Noted. We will comply with all items.</p>	
37.	<p>Please identify the location of all above ground utility equipment on the site plan. Utility equipment should be located so that it does not conflict with pedestrian amenities, resident amenities, landscape features and/or on-site circulation.</p> <p>Response: The revised site plan now labels the above ground utility equipment. This utility equipment is positioned under the project's podium deck. It does not conflict with pedestrian/resident amenities, landscape, or circulation. (See Sheet 4).</p>	KH/TAI
Landscaping:		
38.	<p>Please provide landscape plans that are black line drawings, without and gray tones or colors, so that all copies ;of the landscape plans will be easier to read. Please refer to the Development Review Board Application Checklist, the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications and Zoning Ordinance Section 1.305.</p> <p>Response: - Noted. Plans will not have gray tones or color.</p>	ND
39.	<p>Please provide a landscape plan that indicates the building footprint and does not indicate the interior spaces within each building. Showing the interior spaces on the landscape plan results in too much information on the plan, making it difficult to read. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirement for Development Application and Zoning Ordinance Section 1.305.</p> <p>Response: Noted. Interior spaces will not be shown on landscape plans.</p>	ND
Other:		
40.	<p>Please revise the “Dimensioned Plan” to show the gross lot area and dimensions without the site plan overlay, in accordance with the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. This exhibit should function</p>	TAI

Bishop Lane – Response to 1st Review Comments

No.	Task	Responsibility
	similarly to a graphic legal description for the purpose of identifying the zoning boundary.	
	<p>Response: The gross lot area and dimensions have been placed on the zoning boundary exhibit. (See Sheet 2A)</p>	
41.	<p>The submitted TIMA includes a speculative trip generation comparison to non-existing and non-prior approved land uses (LUC 820 at 0.80 FAR). TIMAs submitted to the City of Scottsdale should not have trip generation comparisons other than what is required per DSPM 5-1.101 D3 – existing land uses and/or previously approved developments under current zoning, if applicable. Please update the TIMA to remove the trip generation comparison for the non-existing and non-prior approved land uses.</p> <p>Response: TIMA has been updated and is provided with this resubmittal.</p>	TC