

Response to First Review Comments

To	Project	
City of Scottsdale Planning & Development Services 7447 E Indian School Road Scottsdale, AZ 85251	Mesrop & Mariam Megerdichian Senior Center 8849 E Cholla St Scottsdale, AZ 85260 APN 217-26-949	
Attention	Case Number	Date
Greg Bloemberg, Senior Planner	25-ZN-2018 and 19-UP-2018	September 30, 2020

Below are the formal responses to the comments received on January 29, 2019 from the City of Scottsdale Planning & Development Services division.

Item	Review / Response
Comment 1	<p>General Plan and Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan Analysis</p> <p>The 2001 General Plan (GP) describes Suburban Neighborhoods as those areas that include medium to small-lot single-family subdivisions and neighborhoods; however, there are currently several residential healthcare facilities zoned R-4 within the Suburban Neighborhoods land use designation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Westminster Village (12000 N. goth Street) • Avalon Care Center (11150 N. 92d Street) • Pueblo Norte (7090 E. Mescal Street) <p>With the next submittal, please provide a comparison between the proposed facility with regard to bed and room count. This comparison will provide transparency to the community by showing how the proposed use and its corresponding intensity are similar to the facilities listed above that already exist within the Suburban Neighborhoods land use designation.</p>
Response 1	<p>The analysis of comparable facilities in the general area with R-4 zoning is shown on pages 14 and 15 of the revised narrative. The table compares 7 such facilities as well as provides averages and the numerical ranges for these various facilities. There is a substantial amount of variety between these facilities and this is reflected in the tables.</p>
Comment 2	<p>Page 10 of the zoning narrative contains a discussion regarding land use mixture within the context area of the subject site. With the next submittal, please remove this discussion and replace with a more direct discussion of the GP land use category, specifically those land uses immediately adjacent to the site.</p>
Response 2	<p>Additional language regarding land use context for the site has been added (page 14) that focuses on the immediate neighboring land uses to the subject site. Language from the General Plan has been quoted in this section for clarification.</p>

- Comment 3 *Page 11 of the zoning narrative inaccurately states that the subject site is not adjacent to Urban Neighborhoods. The adjacent subdivision (Arizona Park Place) is designated as Urban Neighborhoods per the 2001 GP Land Use Map. Please revise the narrative accordingly.*
- Response 3 An enlarged map of the General Plan Land Use map has been included (page 16) and this clearly indicates that the subject site is not next to an Urban Neighborhoods area. The subdivision immediately east of the subject site is zoned R-4, and this would not comply with such a General Land Use Plan designation. R-4 has consistently been included under the Suburban Neighborhoods designation. (A review of these sites across the city has verified this.)
- Comment 4 *Page 11 of the zoning narrative inaccurately states that the subject site is within a proposed Character Area (#5); however, the subject site is actually within an adopted Character Area that is guided by the Shea Area Plan. Please revise the narrative accordingly.*
- Response 4 The site indeed is within the proposed character area #5 (see plan graphic from General Plan on page 24). The relationship of the subject site to both the Cactus Corridor and Shea Area (1993) plans is included on pages 28-31. It is located on the periphery of both area plans and for the most part was not within the primary subject areas and issues of both plans.
- Comment 5 *Page 21 of the zoning narrative inaccurately states that the Cactus Corridor Plan was not brought forward as a component of the 2001 General Plan. In actuality, page 23 of the 2001 GP notes the Cactus Corridor as an approved Character Area Plan. Consequently, the subject site is within both the Shea Character Area Plan and the Cactus Corridor Character Area Plan. Please revise the narrative to include this information, and ensure that the narrative responds to both documents.*
- Response 5 The narrative has been corrected by stating that this plan was adopted by reference in the 2001 General Plan. The original presentation of the Cactus Corridor Plan did not include a resolution, and thereby it was not formally added to the Plan at the time. In the operation of reviewing proposals in the area it was referred to but it did not have 'official' status until the 2001 General Plan amendment resolution was approved.
- Comment 6a *The zoning narrative states that 41,810 square feet of open space will be provided as part of this project; however, the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) narrative states that, while 29,808 square feet of open space is required, only 26,355 square feet will be provided. With the next submittal, please clarify the amount of open space being provided for the rezoning/CUP area, and the overall open space for the site after the proposed project is constructed. Also clarify open space calculations for both the zoning and CUP materials and narratives.*
- Response 6a See the open space plan sheets OSP-2, OSP-3, and OSP-4 that clarifies the amount of open space for the rezoning, the CUP, and overall open space respectively. See the revised zoning and CUP materials and narratives for open space calculation updates as well.
- Comment 6b *The site plan notes that there is an excess 59 parking spaces. It appears more meaningful landscape and open space areas could be provided if excess parking was reduced. Please consider revising*

- the applicable plans to decrease excess parking and increase the amount of meaningful open space for residents.*
- Response 6b The site plan has evolved into four (4) separate site plans with respective project data shown thereto. See sheets A02a, A02b, A02c, and A02d for the R1-35, the R-4 (previously proposed as R-5), the CUP, and the Combined site plans respectively as well as the corresponding open space plans sheets OSP-1, OSP-2, OSP-3, and OSP-4 to see how excess parking has decreased and more open space has been provided for the residents.
- Comment 6c *The proposal is adjacent to single-family neighborhoods to the east and south. With the next submittal, please consider increasing the amount of open space along the east and south property lines to benefit both residents of the project and the adjacent neighborhoods.*
- Response 6c Open space along the east and south property lines has been considered and is reflected on the corresponding open space plan sheets OSP-2, OSP-3, and OSP-4.
- Comment 7 *The Community Mobility Element (Goal 9, bullets 1, 2 and 5 and Goal 12, bullets 7 and 9) of the 2001 General Plan emphasize the importance of vehicular traffic safety throughout Scottsdale neighborhoods. The Citizen Review Plan notes concerns from area residents regarding both high traffic volumes and speeding on Cholla Street. Additionally, the TIMA indicates that traffic volumes on Cholla Street were only monitored over a 4-day period in November of 2018. The report states that, although there did not appear to be a high volume of traffic, there were speeding vehicles observed. Please conduct additional outreach with the neighbors along Cholla Street specific to traffic impacts and document any issues/concerns identified, and/or suggested solutions as part of the next submittal. Provide an update to the Citizen Involvement Report with the next submittal, including any key issues that have been identified since the Open House.*
- Response 7 This comment requests the developer to "conduct additional outreach" and "provide an update to the Citizen Involvement Report with the next submittal." Therefore, CivTech, as the traffic engineering consultant, will work with appropriate members of the development team (legal, public relations, etc.) to reach out to neighbors to identify their concerns (among them "both high traffic volumes and speeding on Cholla Street") and other key issues raised since the Open House. The development team will follow-up with neighbors regarding any mitigation measures proposed to address their concerns and make sure that the neighbors are clear as to what those measures are and what they might mean to them in terms of traffic impacts. After any differences are resolved or the measures are clarified/explained to the satisfaction of the neighbors, CivTech will incorporate the results into a new, revised submittal of the traffic study.
- Comment 8 *A single-family residential "care home" is permitted in R1-35 but is not a permitted use in R-5 zoning. The existing "care home" at the southwest corner of the site (originally constructed in 2015) must be included as part of the ZN/CUP request for the residential healthcare facility to prevent creation of a nonconforming use. Please revise the site plan to include the existing care home as part of the ZN/CUP request, revise the project data to include the number of beds in the existing*

- "care home" in the density calculations, and revise both narratives to acknowledge the existing "care home" in the request.
- Response 8 The existing facility is intended to be included in the Use Permit and the original numbers reflected that. It will be operated as an extension of the new facility and as such is included as a part of and is integral to the proposed senior living facility.
- Comment 9 *Please provide a floor plan worksheet confirming private outdoor living space is being provided for each residential unit. Refer to Section 5.1004.B.1.b of the Zoning Ordinance.*
- Response 9 Per section 5.1004.B.1.b of the Zoning Ordinance, sheets A09, A10 A11 and A12 have been created. Data tables confirming the private outdoor living space for each residential unit is provided only for the proposed second floor (sheet A10) and third floor (sheet A11) of the building. Please note that there are no residential units in the basement and therefore no private outdoor living space calculations are provided on sheet A12. The proposed first floor does have residential units; however, they are exclusively for Skilled Nursing residents who will require 24-hour care and therefore no private outdoor living space calculations are provided on sheet A09.
- Comment 10 *The Open Space plan is confusing. Zoning and CUP square footages differ, as does the amount of. open space to be provided. Rough calculations performed by staff suggest required open space for the R-5 zoned portion of the parcel is 49,362 square feet, while only 41,810 square feet is provided. Additionally, building height does not factor in to the required open space calculation. Required open space for both the R-4 portion (residential healthcare facility) and the RI-35 portion (place of worship) is 24% of the net lot area. Refer to Sections 1.403.P and 5.102.A.14.d of the Zoning Ordinance and revise Open Space plan to clearly call out required/provided open space for the R-4 portion, required/provided open space for the RI-35 portion and required/provided open space for the entire site.*
- Response 10 See the open space plan sheets OSP-1, OSP-2, OSP-3, and OSP-4 that clarifies the amount of open space for the existing RI-35 zoned portion, the proposed R-4 zoned portion (previously proposed as R-5), the CUP, and Combined open space respectively. See the revised zoning and CUP materials and narratives for open space calculation updates as well.
- Comment 11 *Per Section 5.1004.B.1.a of the Zoning Ordinance, required open space shall be a minimum of 20 square feet for every linear foot of street frontage (3,300 square feet), or no more than 50 square feet per linear foot of street frontage (8,250 square feet). The Open Space plan indicates there is 6,211 square feet of frontage open space along Chol la Street, however all the frontage open space is proposed to be included in the rezoned portion of the site (R-5). Eliminating the frontage open space from the RI-35 portion (for the place of worship) creates a nonconformance by eliminating the front open space required for places of worship. Please revise the Open Space plan, specifically the zoning boundary to preserve the frontage open space for the RI-35 portion of the site.*
- Response 11 By changing the rezoning request from R-5 to R-4, the 'frontage open space' development standard category no longer applies. The substantial open space and landscaping setback from Cactus Road

will remain. See the open space plan sheets OSP-1, OSP-2, and OSP-4 that clarifies the amount of frontage open space for the existing R1-35 zoned portion, the proposed R-4 zoned portion (previously proposed as R-5), and Combined open space respectively. See the revised zoning and CUP materials and narratives for open space calculation updates as well.

Comment 12 *Please revise the site plan to include separate project data for the R-5 and R1-35 zoned portions of the site, to include gross/net lot area, applicable development standards, parking, etc. Refer to Sections 1.403.P and 5.102.A.14 of the Zoning Ordinance for applicable development standards and Table 9.103.A of the Zoning Ordinance for parking requirements.*

Response 12 Separate site plans for R1-35, R-4 (previously proposed as R-5), CUP, and Combined have been created. Each site plan reflects its corresponding project data in compliance with Zoning Ordinance sections 1.403.P and 5.102.A.14 as well as Table 9.103.A with respect to the applicable development standards. See sheets A02a, A02b, A02c, and A02d respectively.

Traffic Impact and Mitigation Analysis

Comment 13 *Comments pending*

Response 13 No formal response has been prepared since comments were pending at the time in which the first review was completed and issued.

Drainage

Comment 14 *The preliminary drainage report has not been accepted by the Storm Water Division. Please see drainage report for comments and revise accordingly.*

Response 14 Please see attached Drainage Report and review responses for the drainage report.

Site Design

Comment 15 *Please revise the site plan to confirm all proposed internal sidewalks will be a minimum of six feet in width. Refer to Sections 2-1.310 and 2-1.312 of the DSPM.*

Response 15 All proposed internal sidewalks are drawn and dimensioned at six feet in width. See sheets A02b, A02c, and A02d for clarity.

Comment 16 *Please provide a site plan that is a black-line drawing, without any gray tones, colors or landscape symbols so that all copies of the site plan will be legible. Refer to the Plan and Report Requirements for Development Applications (PRRDA).*

Response 16 The graphics for site plan sheets A02a, A02b, A02c, and A02d are now in compliance with the PRRDA.

Comment 17 *Please provide a site plan and project data that complies with the PRRDA. There may be additional comments once the revised site plan has been received and reviewed by staff.*

Response 17 The graphics and project data tables for site plan sheets A02a, A02b, A02c, and A02d are now in compliance with the PRRDA.

Engineering

Comment 18 *As currently shown on the site plan, the site is deficient with regard to the number of required refuse enclosures. Per Section 2-1.309 of the DSPM, a minimum of one enclosure for every 20,000 square feet of commercial floor area is required. Please revise the site plan accordingly to demonstrate compliance; or if a trash compactor is proposed, show location and provide compactor details.*

Response 18 Per table 2-1.311.B of the DSPM, the proposed CUP site plan shows (1) enclosed refuse compactor. See sheets A02b, A02c, and A02d for the refuse compactor location and required details. All trash collection shall be by owner agreement with the designated trash collection company. The agreement shall be based on the owner's desired weekly frequency for pickups.

Fire

Comment 19a *Please revise the site plan to demonstrate/respond to the following:
Location of required Fire Department Connection (Fire Ordinance 4283, 912}*

Response 19a The Fire Department Connection (or FDC) location is shown on the site plan sheets A02b, A02c, and A02d for the proposed Residential Health Care Building 1.

Comment 19b *Divided entrance and bypass lanes must be a minimum of 20 feet in width (Section 2-1.303 of the DSPM)*

Response 19b The divided entrance and bypass lanes are dimensioned on the site plan sheets A02a, A02b, A02c, and A02d and are in compliance with section 2-1.303 of the DSPM.

Comment 19c *Commercial turning radii for all fire lanes (25' inner, 49' outer, 55' bucket swing) (Section 2- 1.303 of the DSPM)*

Response 19c The proposed commercial turning radii for all fire lanes are dimensioned on the pedestrian and vehicular circulation plan (sheet A05) and are in compliance with section 2-1.303 of the DSPM.

****comments 20 and 21 were not provided by staff for response at the time the review was completed and issued****

Comment 22 *Please revise the site plan to identify proposed fire lanes. Refer to Section 2-1.802 of the DSPM.*

Response 22 Designated fire lanes are identified on the Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation Plan (sheet A05).

Water and Waste Water

Comment 23 *The preliminary Basis of Design (BOD) report has not been accepted by the Water Resources Division. Please refer to the red lined BOD and revise to comply with Sections 6-1.201 and 7-1.201 of the DSPM.*

Response 23 Please see attached Water and Sewer Design Report and review responses.

Traffic Impact and Mitigation Analysis

Comment 24 *Comments pending*

Response 24 No formal response has been prepared since comments were pending at the time in which the first review was completed and issued.

Technical Corrections - Site

Comment 25 *Please revise the site plan to indicate require/provide accessible parking for each use, and the total provided. Site appears to comply, but site plan needs to be revised to confirm overall site compliance. Refer to Section 9.105 of the Zoning Ordinance.*

Response 25 The site plan has been clarified into separate site plan sheets for the R1-35 portion, the R-4 zoned portion, the CUP, and the Combined site. See sheets A02a, A02b, A02c, and A02d for the accessible parking required and provided breakdowns for each.

Comment 26 *Please revise the site plan to include required/provided bicycle parking, including supporting calculations. Refer to Section 9.103.C of the Zoning Ordinance.*

Response 26 The site plan has been clarified into separate site plan sheets for the R1-35 portion, the R-4 zoned portion (previously proposed as R-5), the CUP, and the Combined site. See sheets A02a, A02b, A02c, and A02d for the bicycle parking required and provided breakdowns for each.

Comment 27 *Please revise the site plan to include the location for existing and proposed utility equipment. New utility equipment should be located so that it does not conflict with pedestrian amenities, resident amenities, landscape features or on-site circulation.*

Response 27 Proposed utilities do not conflict with any of the above.

Technical Corrections - Fire

Comment 28 *Please note for the DRB submittal that this project will require an NFPA 13 compliant fire sprinkler system.*

Response 28 The building floor plan sheets (sheets A09, A10, A11, and A12) note that an NFPA 13 compliant fire sprinkler system will be provided.

Technical Corrections – Landscape Design

Comment 29 *Please revise the landscape plan to include summary data indicating the landscape area (in square feet) of on-site, right-of-way and parking lot landscaping. Also indicate the number of mature trees proposed. Refer to Sections 10.200 and 10.502.B.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.*

Response 29 The landscape plan includes the summary data for landscape area for on-site, ROW, and parking lot in sq. Ft. Included the number of mature proposed, trees.

Technical Corrections – Engineering

Comment 30 *Please note: all non-residential facilities are required to provide a reduced pressure backflow assembly (BFP). As such, the proposed residential healthcare facility will be required to provide a BFP. Please acknowledge on the site plan and show potential location for BFP. Refer to Section 6-1.417 of the DSPM.*

Response 30 We are proposing a new Backflow assembly for the new residential healthcare facility.

Comment 31 *Please note: all water and sewer lines are required to be contained within a Water and Sewer Facilities Easement. Please revise the site plan to show location of said easement. Refer to Section 6-1.419 of the DSPM.*

Response 31 The waterline is public and is within a 16' water easement. The sewer is private.

Technical Corrections – Building Elevations

Understanding the building elevations provided are conceptual, please note the following for the final elevations that will eventually be submitted with the DRB application (staff will be looking for this information):

Comment 32a *To improve readability, add number notations (0.0, +1.5, -0.5) to indicate the differences between planer surfaces, or utilize thicker and thinner line widths to indicate portions of the building that are nearer or farther from view.*

Response 32a Number notations indicating the differences between planar surfaces have been added to the building elevations sheets (sheets A06 and A07) as well as line weight priority to help distinguish depth.

Comment 32b *Provide keynotes that indicate location of materials and colors*

Response 32b Keynotes indicating location of materials and colors have been added to the building elevation sheets A06 and A07.

- Comment 32c *Utilize materials and colors that include textures and muted colors that are representative of the surrounding desert context.*
- Response 32c The building elevation sheets (sheets A06 and A07) indicate materials and colors that are complimentary to the surrounding desert context.
- Comment 32d *Provide window sections confirming windows will be recessed a minimum of 50% of the external wall thickness, and door sections that confirm doors will be recessed a minimum of 30% of the external wall thickness.*
- Response 32d Wall sections have been provided showing windows recessed at 50% of the external wall thickness and doors recessed at 30% of the external wall thickness. See sheet A13 for clarity.
- Comment 32e *Provide sections for external shading devices. Include information that describes the shading/shadowing that will be accomplished, given the vertical dimension of the wall opening.*
- Refer to the following
link: <http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/design/shading>
- Response 32e A typical wall section on sheet A13 (taken at a residential unit) shows the fixed horizontal overhang and its total depth measured from the face of the exterior wall framing. Window shading will be accomplished by this element (and similarly others) to minimize solar heat gain to the space beyond as well as the use of high performance glazing.
- Comment 32f *Indicate locations for wall-mounted light fixtures.*
- Response 32f Wall mounted light fixtures are shown on the building elevation sheets A06 and A07 as well as the exterior lighting site plan and photometric analysis sheets E1.0 and PH1.0 respectively.
- Comment 32g *Indicate location of proposed Service Entrance Section (SES).*
- Response 32g The proposed Service Entrance Section (SES) location is shown on the site plan, floor plan, and building elevation sheets.
- Comment 32h *Confirm roof-mounted mechanical equipment will be sufficiently screened from off-site view by a parapet wall or other suitable screening device.*
- Response 32h A note confirming the roof-mounted mechanical equipment being sufficiently screened has been added to the building elevation sheets A06 and A07.
- Comment 32i *Confirm roof drainage will be internal to the building wall, except for necessary overflow scuppers.*
- Response 32i A note confirming roof drainage will be internal to the building wall except for overflow scuppers has been added to the floor plan and building elevation sheets.

Technical Corrections – Landscape Design

- Understanding the landscape plan is conceptual, please note the following for the final landscape plan to be submitted with the DRB application (staff will be looking for this information):*
- Comment 33a *Based on the mature size of the proposed plats, modify the planting density and layout so that it is representative of the mature size of the proposed species, relative to planting area. In general, a 20-30% reduction of planting intensity should be implemented to avoid overcrowding of plants and the need to excessively trim or shear plantings.*
- Response 33a All plant symbols drawn at full maturity and quantities reduced to prevent overcrowding.

- Comment 33b *Coordinate the landscape plan with the lighting plan to ensure there will be no conflicts between mature-size trees and light poles/fixtures. To avoid conflicts, shift either the location of the trees or the location of the light fixtures so there is at least 20 feet between the tree trunks and light fixtures.*
- Response 33b *Coordinated with lighting to ensure 20' from light fixture to tree trunks.*
- Comment 33c *Utilize a dashed line to indicate the required sight visibility triangle at the main entrance to the property at Cholla Street.*
- Response 33c *Added the sight visibility triangle at Cholla Street.*
- Comment 33d *Add the following note: Thorny trees, shrubs and cacti shall be planted so the mature size/canopy is at least four feet from any walkways or parking area curbing.*
- Response 33d *The note has been added to the planting plan.*

Other

- Comment 34 *Please confirm that there are no plans to split the R-5 portion of the parcel from the R1-35 portion of the parcel. Note: if the plan is to create two parcels, a Planned Shared Development (PSD) zoning overlay will likely be required; which requires City Council approval and a Development Agreement.*
- Response 34 *The owner of the property (Western Diocese of the Armenian Church of North America) has prepared a letter stating that there is no intent to sell the property nor split the R-4 portion of the parcel (previously proposed as R-5) from the R1-35 portion. See attached letter thereto dated September 28, 2020.*
-