



(602) 330-5252

September 19, 2022

Greg Bloemberg
City of Scottsdale
7447 East Indian School Road Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: 6-ZN-2022; Scottsdale 3200 North (aka 3202 Scottsdale)

Mr. Bloemberg:

In response to the Planning & Development Services 2nd Review Comments for the subject case, we submit the following to outline our corrective actions pursuant to City comments.

Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues

Zoning:

1. Based on the site plan, it appears this project needs an amendment to the “Building Location” requirements spelled out in Section 5.3006.F of the Zoning Ordinance, in addition to the amendment(s) currently identified in the legislative draft. Per this section, a minimum of 25% of the length of the building façade shall be located at the minimum building setback along Scottsdale Road; and 50% of the building façade shall be located at the minimum setback along 71st Street (the minimum setback for both streets is 20 feet from back of curb). The site plan indicates a proposed setback of 26 feet on Scottsdale Road and 23 feet on 71st Street; with no portion of the building façade at the minimum setback on either street. Please review this section and include any amendments in your legislative draft, or revise site plan to demonstrate compliance.

Increased setbacks along adjacent streets better allow for meaningful landscape and pedestrian experience. As a result, the proposed increased setbacks of 26-feet along Scottsdale Road and 23-feet along 71st Street have been incorporated in our amended development standards request. A revised legislative draft outlining this has been included in the resubmittal.

2. For the legislative draft of the amended development standards for Section 5.3006, the wrong section is proposed be amended. The amendment should be to Section 5.3006.I.3, not 5.3006.H.3. as indicated below. Please revise accordingly. Also, confirm no additional amendments are needed. “Subject to design approval by the Development Review Board, in a Type 2 Area, Type 2.5 Area or Type 3 Area, a maximum ~~fifteen (15)~~ **seventeen (17)** feet exception to the stepback and setback standards above the first floor (not specified in I.2 above), is allowed for projects that.....”

Needs to be discussed

Engineering:

3. From 1st review, the following construction restrictions must be acknowledged with the zoning case. Please either acknowledge in response letter or add a note to the site plan.

Marshalling & Storage Yard:

- City rights-of-way cannot be used for marshalling or construction storage yards without approval from the City's Transportation Division and Right-of-Way Manager, and payment of the associated fee through the application and approval process.
- Any soil nails or tie back systems extending beyond the property line may not extend onto private property or be made of steel. For extensions into City right-of-way, a Private Improvements in the Right-of-Way (PIR) agreement will need to be executed.

We acknowledge the construction restrictions. A construction mitigation map will be included with the Development Review Board application for approval of the building elevations and site plan.

4. From 1st review, the overhead utility lines along the north property line must be buried as part of this development. Please revise the site plan to acknowledge requirement. Refer to Section 47-80 of the Scottsdale Revised Code.

A Note has been added to the lower righthand corner of the Site Plan to identify the project's intent to underground the existing overhead utility lines along the north property line.

Drainage:

Pursuant to an email from Greg Bloemberg dated 9/14/22, there are no additional drainage comments.

Water and Wastewater:

5. The 2nd submittal BOD's have not been accepted by Water Resources. Please see comments below and redline reports in internet folder and revise accordingly.

Water:

- The two large developments to the north have two large domestic water meters each, one tied to the Scottsdale Road main on the east and one tied to the 71st Street main to the west. This is done to reduce complete reliance on a single main should a prolonged shutdown occur on either main. Water Resources recommends implementing the same concept for this development, but the decision is ultimately up to the applicant and their designer. If two meters were to be implemented for a single building, the two meters would be designed for the demands of distinct separate sections of a single building and, per applicable code, can never be connected within the internal plumbing system, as fire wall separation would prevent it.

Pursuant to discussions between the Engineer (SEG) and City staff (Levi Dillion) it was agreed that dual water meters are not necessary, and the Water Basis of Design report as submitted in the 1st review is acceptable.

Sewer:

- Incorrect land use classification for fitness center (Section 7-1.403, Table 4.3 of the DSPM).
- Incorrect demand multiplier/peaking factor for fitness center (Section 7-1.403 of the DSPM).
- From 1st review, connect to public sewer via MAG 426 Type B drop connection. Coat manhole per City standard due to excessive chlorinated water and pool chemicals in the proposed and existing developments (Section 7-1.409 of the DSPM).
- Provide proposed and existing pool filter backwash flow detailed calculations meeting ARS Title 18, Article 2 design requirements, or as otherwise stated here. The value shown assumes default backwash value of 100 gpm per pool. These are very large pools and default value is not adequate. There will be three large pools (two existing) on this line and large hot tubs (two existing). To analyze offsite sewer system capacity use 50% of total combined backwash peak flows for pools and spas. For existing pools and spas measure area from aerial and scale proposed pool backwash rate to provide values. For filter sizing use pool volume turnover rate of six hours and use 20 minutes for spa. NOTE: Cartridge filters cannot be assumed.
- From 1st review, each lot or building must be provided its own individual service line unless otherwise approved in writing by Water Resources. The service line location should be coordinated to avoid conflicts with other utilities or placement within driveway locations, and should be located within the downstream 1/3 of the fronting SS line length (Section 7-1.409 of the DSPM).
- If available, provide City approved report in Appendix for the Alta Osborn BOD which has no stamp of approval.
- Wastewater flows referenced in the body of this BOD from the Alta and Agave report do not include the 100 gpm addition for pool backwashing.
- Wastewater flows should be shown in gpm.
- Report states a food facility is included and a grease interceptor will be provided. Confirm the addition of such a facility, describe it and revise report details including utility plan showing interceptor.

The Sewer Basis of Design report has been updated and can be identified with a revision date of 9/14/2022. A revised copy of this report has been included with the 3rd submittal.

Significant Policy Related Issues

Engineering:

6. From 1st review, please indicate how users of the proposed loading zone are able to access the interior of the building. NOTE: City rights-of-way and sidewalks cannot be used to go from loading zone into the parking garage.

The Parking Plan has been revised to show a removal of a portion of the second floor garage to provide a minimum of 16'-6" clearance above the trash compactor.

7. From 1st review, compactors may be used as an alternative to commercial refuse or recycling containers. To determine adequacy & site location of compactors, please update the refuse plan to include the following:
- Location: Place the compactor and approach pad so that the service vehicle route to and from the public street has a minimum unobstructed vertical clearance of 16 feet 6 inches, and an unobstructed vertical clearance above the staging area and compactor location of 25 feet (this height may be reduced for horizontal compactors placed on a platform at the same elevation as the truck bed).
 - Non-self-contained compactors will require a grease interceptor with drain placed in compactor enclosure.

The 2nd submittal refuse plan appears to indicate that the 2nd level parking garage extends over the proposed compactor. Please clarify using criteria above.

The Refuse plan has been revised to indicate roll-up gate on-site internal direct access from the parking garage to the loading area and trash compactor.

Building Elevation Design:

8. From 1st review, the OTSUDAG discourage elongated floorplates greater than 3X the building width. Please revise building design to include additional articulation to the north side of the building.

The building elevations have been revised to provide additional articulation along the north side of the building.

9. From 1st review, the OTSUDAG encourage additional treatment and architectural integration of parking structures that are in prominent areas or visible from pedestrian areas. The proposed parking structure is the main architectural feature of the western side of the site and warrants additional details and architectural features. Refer to Guideline 15 of the OTSUDAG.

The building elevations have been revised to improve the architectural integration of the parking portion of the building into the overall architecture.

Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis (TIMA):

10. The 2nd submittal TIMA has not been accepted by Transportation Engineering. Please refer to comments below and revise accordingly.

- Page 6 – text identifies crash with southbound left-turn and northbound through then states that a southbound through was cited. Please clarify.

Clarified as requested

- Page 6 – study identifies Am peak hour as 11:30 AM-12:30PM. Limit AM peak hour to the highest 60-minute period between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM.

Clarified as requested

- Staff did not see a trip assignment figure. Which land use combination was used for trip assignment?? What are Figures 19-23?? What makes these “site approach and departure volumes” or “site turning volumes”?? Similarly, how is Figure 25 existing plus site as described in text?? Based on the trip generation figure and volumes for the site, only two peak hour trips were added to the northbound left-turn movement during the AM peak hour. With the highest of the two proposed land use combinations showing 24 AM peak hour entering trips and 55% of

trips entering the site on 71st Street, northbound from Earll Drive, it would be assumed that a majority entered from Scottsdale Road. Even with 50/50 north/south distribution, this would be approximately seven trips added to the northbound left-turn movement. Revise trip distribution figure to show trip O/D at the analyzed intersection and a full trip assignment figure at the site driveways and the analyzed intersection.

Corrected as requested

- Page 27 – revise LOS to match correct AM peak hour period.

Changed as requested

- Page 30 – left turn analysis may need to be revised based on AM peak hour.

No change necessary as evening peak hour remains the largest hourly volume. Note, the morning peak hour, as directed by the City of Scottsdale for analysis, is substantially less volume than the mid-day peak hour volumes utilized in the initial report.

- Appendix – Synchro shows that right-turn on red was allowed for westbound traffic. Regulatory signing restricts this movement. Westbound RTOR should be disabled in these calculations. Revise accordingly.

Corrected as requested.

Technical Corrections

Engineering:

11. From 1st review, please update site plan to confirm project design will be based on the MCDOT benchmark system and in accordance with the FEMA Benchmark Maintenance criteria. Refer to Section 3-1.701.I of the DSPM.

A note has been added to the lower righthand corner of the Site Plan identifying the design of the project is based on the MCDOT benchmark system.

The revised application has been resubmitted pursuant to the requirements identified in **Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist** that was included with the 2nd review comment letter and included herein. If you have any questions or need further information, please contact me at (602) 330-5252 or DGULINO@LDSERVICES.NET

Thank you,



David Gulino
Land Development Services, LLC

cc. Jon Coulter, Desert Troon Companies

ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: 6-ZN-2022

- COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in this 1st Review Comment Letter
- Revised Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis (TIMA)
- Revised Trip Generation Comparison (included in TIMA)
- Revised Context Aerial with the proposed Site Plan superimposed
- Revised Site Plan
- Revised Refuse Plan
- Revised Building Elevations
- Revised Perspective(s)
- Revised Legislative Draft for Amended Development Standards
- Other Supplemental Materials:

Technical Reports:

- Revised Wastewater Design Report