RESPONSES

2035 General Plan and Shea Area Plan Significant Issues

1. As per application requirement No. 14 of the General Plan Amendment Development Application Checklist, a context graphic depicting the existing General Plan 2035 land use designation (Commercial) and the proposed General Plan 2035 land use designation (Mixed- Use Neighborhoods) for the subject property should have been provided within the submittal packet. With a resubmittal, provide this series of graphics, including the total gross acreage of the requested change.

   RESPONSE: UPDATED SHEET A1.2 TO INCLUDE GROSS ACREAGE BETWEEN EACH PROPERTY AND GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION

2. Page 18 of the narrative states that "The property is located within an Urban Character Area of the 2035 General Plan" in response to the Character Area Criteria. Although the property is located within the Urban Character Type, the subject site is located within the Shea Area Plan. With a resubmittal, please state such, clarifying that the application's response to that Character Area Plan is provided on pages 24 through 26 of the narrative.

   RESPONSE: THE INCORRECT REFERENCE TO URBAN CHARACTER TYPE IN THIS RESPONSE TO URBAN CHARACTER AREA QUESTION HAS BEEN REMOVED. THE PARAGRAPH NOW TALKS ABOUT THE SHEA AREA PLAN AND AS SUGGESTED REFERENCES THE DEEPER ANALYSIS LATER IN THE NARRATIVE.

3. Page 24, in response to Housing Element Policy H 1.5, states that the proposed density of 219 dwelling units "is comparable with the larger area's existing apartment developments". With a resubmittal, for clarity, please expand further on this statement, noting context area multifamily developments and their comparable densities.

   RESPONSE: THE REFERENCE TO OTHER APARTMENT PROJECTS HAS BEEN REMOVED AS SUCH A COMPARISON IS NOT NECESSARY TO RESPOND TO THE HOUSING POLICY. THERE ARE NO EXISTING APARTMENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA.

4. The General Plan Land Use Element (Goal LU 2) promotes the sensitive transition and integration of land uses within the surrounding natural and built environments. The entire site is proposed as a PUD district; however, few of the submitted materials note interaction between the existing commercial complex and the proposed residential component – topics such as connectivity, open space, etc., and should be treated as a singular submittal and not just specific to the residential component. Furthermore, and as a mixed-use proposal, it is expected that the entire site, inclusive of existing commercial to the north, is fully integrated in terms of pedestrian improvements, walkways, and design. With a resubmittal, please provide narrative and graphical response that confirms transition and integration of the proposed multifamily residential and the existing retail and office site.

   RESPONSE: SEE SHEET A1.6.1 SHOWING PEDESTRIAN PATHS CONNECTING THE MULTI-FAMILY WITH THE OFFICE/RETAIL AND SHEA BLVD. ALSO, AS RECOMMENDED, LU2 HAS BEEN ADDED

INTO THE NARRATIVE AND ADDITIONAL NARRATIVE LANGUAGE HAS BEEN INCLUDED DISCUSSING THE INTEGRATION AND TRANSITION WITH THE SURROUNDING ENVIRONMENT.

5. The General Plan Open Space Element (Goal OS 4 and supporting policies) seeks to protect and improve the quality of Scottsdale's natural and urban environments as defined in the quality and quantity of its open spaces. To that end, Policy OS 4.3 Bullet 1 states that Scenic Corridors should be designated along major streets where a significant landscaped buffer is needed between streets and adjacent land uses, where an enhanced streetscape appearance is desired, and where views to mountains and natural or man-made features will be maximized. More specifically, the General Plan identifies Shea Boulevard as a Scenic Corridor, where 100' landscaped setbacks are expected as a means to preserve views and create a sense of openness. Previous approvals (11-ZN-2002) for the subject site allowed for an 80-foot minimum, 100-foot average Scenic Corridor along Shea Boulevard – which was the standard at the time. However, since that time the community revised the standards for these roadways with case 1-GP-2004 and introduced new standards for Scenic Corridors which now includes a 100-foot minimum width for such designated areas. Although page 23 of the narrative briefly discusses the existing "open space corridor along Shea Boulevard", there doesn't appear to be information regarding the existing Scenic Corridor easements and how the Shea Boulevard edge may transition over time as a result of future development. With a resubmittal, please provide a Scenic Corridor analysis for Shea Boulevard that graphically and narratively discusses the existing conditions, including minimum and average widths. Furthermore, provide confirmation that if future development efforts occur along this edge, a 100' minimum-width Scenic Corridor will be attained via new map of dedication.

   RESPONSE: NOTED 100' MIN SETBACK / SCENIC CORRIDOR ON SHEET A1.3.1. NOTED AVERAGE SETBACK 91.36 FT. ALSO, WITHIN THE NARRATIVE SECTION DISCUSSING THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, A SEPARATE PARAGRAPH HAS BEEN ADDED ON THE SHEA BOULEVARD SCENIC CORRIDOR.

6. The McCormick Ranch Landscape Master Plan (Case 46-DR-2016) informs landscaping materials to be utilized within all landscaped areas owned and managed by the McCormick Ranch Property Owners Association. Although the subject property will not be managed by this entity or governed by the referenced document, ensuring that landscaping reinforces the character of the area is important as per both the General Plan (Character and Design Element Goal CD 5) and Shea Area Plan (Goal 1). With a resubmittal, demonstrate how this proposal will be compatible with the above referenced document, both narratively and graphically (updated Landscape Plan). To assist with the response; the noted plan can be found at: https://eservices.scottsdaleaz.gov/bldgresources/Cases/Details/46730

   RESPONSE: OVER 75% OF THE PLANT MATERIAL SELECTIONS FOR OUR PROJECT ARE ON THE MCCORMICK RANCH PLANT LIST, WITH THE REMAINING SELECTIONS SHARING THE SAME OVERALL AESTHETIC. THE LANDSCAPE WILL TIE INTO BOTH THE EXISTING 9400 SHEA SITE AS WELL AS THE MCCORMICK RANCH PLANTING SCHEME. REFERENCE TO THE MCCORMICK RANCH LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN HAS BEEN ADDED TO THE NARRATIVE.

7. If further outreach has been conducted since the original submittal, and as a response to Goal CI 1 of the Community Involvement Element as well as Policy LU 3.5 of the Land Use 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 and how the forthcoming resubmittal has responded to such items.

RESPONSE: OUTREACH CONTINUES WITH THE PROJECT'S NEIGHBORS INCLUDING THE MCCORMICK RANCH AND SCOTTSDALE RANCH ASSOCIATIONS AS WELL AS THE IRONWOOD CONDOMINIUM HOA TO OUR DIRECT SOUTH. RATHER THAN PROVIDE AN INTERIM UPDATE TO THE CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT REPORT WITH THIS RESUBMITTAL, WE WILL WORK ON ONE AND PROVIDE IT BEFORE PUBLIC HEARINGS THAT DETAILS ALL THE CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT THOUGH THAT POINT.

Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues

Drainage:

8. Please submit revised Drainage documents addressing the following:
    a. The concept includes filling the existing retention basins and conveying the onsite flows directly to the existing storm drain. The attached approved reports and correspondence address the storage issue but no mention of filling the basin. Provide documentations to support that the existing basins are obsolete and provide excerpt from existing reports if any.

RESPONSE: PER THE FINAL CVS CAREMARK DRAINAGE REPORT PREPARED BY JMA ENGINEERING DATED 7/13/2011, THIS NORTHERN DEPRESSION INDICATED AS "RETENTION" ON OUR SURVEY IS NOT INCLUDED AS ONE OF THE 9 PROPOSED ON-SITE DETENTION BASINS IN THEIR REPORT. UPON FURTHER INVESTIGATION OF THE CVS CAREMARK PARKING RELOCATION PLANS, THIS AREA OF COVERED PARKING AND THIS DEPRESSION ARE INDICATED TO BE DEMOLISHED. IN ADDITION, NO STORM STRUCTURES ARE PROVIDED INTO OR OUT OF THIS DEPRESSED AREA. FINALLY, AFTER REVIEWING BOTH THE CLOUSE ENGINEERING AND THE 94 HUNDRED SHEA DRAINAGE REPORTS, THIS COVERED PARKING AND DEPRESSED LANDSCAPE AREA IS ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE WESTERN 48" STORM SEWER SERVICE AREA. THEREFORE, IT IS MY CONCLUSION THAT THIS DEPRESSED LANDSCAPE AREA SERVES NO SIGNIFICANT DRAINAGE PURPOSE FOR ANY SURROUNDING EXISTING OR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

THE SOUTHERN ROW OF RETENTION BASINS APPEARS TO JUST BE A COLLECTION POINT FOR PARKING RUNOFF. NO STORM SEWER OR DRYWELLS OF ANY KIND EXISTS IN THIS DEPRESSED LANDSCAPE STRIP. IT APPEARS THAT RUNOFF FROM THE EXISTING PARKING LOT COLLECTS IN THIS DEPRESSED LANDSCAPE AREA AND EVENTUALLY PERCOLATES INTO THE SOIL. WITH THE PARKING LOT BEING REMOVED THIS LANDSCAPE AREA WILL NO LONGER SERVE ANY KIND OF PURPOSE AS ALL ONSITE FLOW WILL BE DIRECTED TO THE EXISTING 48" STORM SEWER.

    b. The storm drain hydraulics need to evaluate the entire system. The existing basins were developed as part of the master drain plan therefore the contributing areas needs to be reviewed. The pipe capacity needs to include not only 48" pipe within the parcel but

also upstream and downstream. The pipe downstream also receives flow from 92nd Street.

RESPONSE: PER THE CLOUSE ENGINEERING DRAINAGE REPORT, IT IS INDICATED ON PAGE 4 THAT THE EXISTING 48" PIPE WAS INSTALLED WITH A CAPACITY OF APPROXIMATELY 110 CFS. LOOKING AT THE DRAINAGE REPORT FOR 94 HUNDRED SHEA, IT IS INDICATED IN THEIR DRAINAGE EXHIBIT "A" THAT PHASE I AND PHASE II COMBINED WILL SEND A Q_{100} OF 71.7 CFS TO OUR PROPOSED CONNECTION POINT ON THE EXISTING 48" PIPE. PHASE II WAS NEVER CONSTRUCTED SO IT CAN BE CONCLUDED THAT ONLY 47.3 CFS FROM PHASE I IS BEING RECEIVED AT OUR CONNECTION POINT TODAY. THEREFORE, AS PART OF THIS REZONING EFFORT WE HAVE 62.7 CFS OF CAPACITY REMAINING AT OUR CONNECTION POINT. PER THE DRAINAGE ANALYSIS ON PAGE 4 OF THE DRAINAGE REPORT WE PROPOSE A 100-YEAR FLOW OF 23.96 CFS AT OUR CONNECTION POINT. IN CONCLUSION, THIS IS 38.74 CFS LESS THAN THE ALLOWABLE REMAINING CAPACITY MAKING THIS CONNECTION POINT ADEQUATE FOR THIS DEVELOPMENT.

c. First Flush requirements must be addressed even with a waiver.

RESPONSE: FIRST FLUSH TREATMENT WILL BE HANDLED BY A CONTECH HYDRODYNAMIC SEPARATOR INSTALLED AT THE OUTFALL POINT JUST BEFORE CONNECTING TO THE EXISTING 48" STORM SEWER. THIS SEPARATOR HAS BEEN SIZED TO TREAT THE FIRST HALF INCH OF RAINFALL.

Water and Wastewater:

9. Please submit revised Water and Wastewater Design Report(s), addressing the document redlines and the following:

WATER:

a. Hydrant flow test is from 2020. Needs be to updated. DSPM 6-1.202.

RESPONSE: AN UPDATED HYDRANT FLOW TEST REPORT CONDUCTED ON MAY 20TH, 2022, HAS BEEN PROVIDED. PLEASE REFERENCE EXHIBIT 5: *HYDRANT FLOW TEST REPORT* OF THE PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT.

b. Identify pressure at the highest finished floor at the worst case location (Scenario 3) DSPM 6-1.202.G.6.c.ii.

RESPONSE: PLEASE REFERENCE THE PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT FOR UPDATED PRESSURE.

c. Scenario 4: Demonstrate minimum domestic service pressure of 50 psi can be maintained at the highest proposed finished floor elevation for the worst hydraulic case domestic demand node. DSPM 6-1.202.G.6.d.

RESPONSE: PLEASE REFERENCE THE PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT FOR UPDATED PRESSURE.

d. Correct all four modeling tables to be consistent with the demands calculated in Section E of the Water BOD per DSPM 6-1.202 and 6-1.406. Include tables showing velocities per DSPM 6-1.202.H.3.

RESPONSE: THE WATER MODEL HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT ACCURATE DOMESTIC DEMANDS. IN ADDITION, THE MODEL LINKS (PIPES) HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT FOR REFERENCE.

e. A vault is required for the 3" meters. DSPM 6-1.416.

RESPONSE: THE WATER MODEL HAS BEEN UPDATED TO REFLECT ACCURATE DOMESTIC DEMANDS. IN ADDITION, THE MODEL LINKS (PIPES) HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT FOR REFERENCE.

f. Show all easements. DSPM 6-1.402.B.

RESPONSE: ALL EASEMENTS ARE SHOWN ON EXHIBIT 3: OVERALL SITE PLAN.

g. Water lines shall not be located within 10-feet of a building or retaining wall without providing additional protection per DSPM 6-1.402.

RESPONSE: NO WATER LINE IS LOCATED WITHIN 10-FT OF THE BUILDING OR RETAINING WALL. DIMENSIONS HAVE BEEN ADDED TO EXHIBIT 6: PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT.

h. Water meters are to be accessible to city workers and be located as close as possible to the water main. DSPM 6-1.416.G.

RESPONSE: ALL WATER METERS HAVE BEEN PLACED DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO DRIVE LANES FOR CITY WORKERS TO ACCESS. PLEASE REFERENCE EXHIBIT 6: PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT.

i. Show how the FDC/riser is connected to the distribution loop (fire line) DSPM 6-1.504. Include backflow preventer. DSPM 6-1.417.

RESPONSE: A FIRE LINE HAS BEEN ADDED TO PROVIDE SERVICE TO THE BUILDING FDC. PLEASE REFERENCE EXHIBIT 6: PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT.

j. Water service lines shall be continuous from the main to the meter with no bends or joints. DSPM 6-1-416.J

RESPONSE: THE WATER SERVICE LINE HAS BEEN UPDATED TO BE CONTINUOUS. PLEASE REFERENCE EXHIBIT 6: PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGN WATER REPORT.

SEWER:

k. Onsite sewer is discharging to private sewer. Comply with requirements of SRC Sec. 49-118.

RESPONSE: THE BLANKET EASEMENT STATES: SHEA HEREBY GRANTS AND CONVEYS TO KAPLAN, FOR THE BENEFIT OF KAPLAN, THE KAPLAN PROPERTY, AND KAPLAN'S SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS, A PERPETUAL, NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, INSTALLATION, OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, REPLACEMENT, RELOCATION AND REMOVAL OF FACILITIES AND SYSTEMS FOR UTILITY SERVICES SERVING ANY PART OF THE KAPLAN PROPERTY (THE "SHEA UTILITY EASEMENTS"), WITH SUCH SERVICES INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION ELECTRICITY, TELEPHONE, TELEVISION, OTHER TELECOMMUNICATIONS, FIBER OPTICS, SANITARY SEWER, STORM SEWER, WATER, AND GAS AND WITH SUCH FACILITIES AND SYSTEMS INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION CABLES, CONDUITS, PIPES, MAINS, MANHOLES, METERS, HYDRANTS, TRANSFORMERS, AND RISERS.

SHEA'S UTILITY EASEMENTS DOCUMENT WILL BE PROVIDED UPON RECORDATION WITH THE CITY OF SCOTTSDALE.

l. Correct demand calculations per dwelling unit counts, commercial square footage and pool demands. DSPM 7-1.403.

RESPONSE: THE COMBINED FLOWS FOR APARTMENT, CLUBHOUSE, AND POOL ARE COMPUTED TO SHOW AN AVERAGE DAILY FLOW (36,274 GPD) AND PEAK DAILY FLOW (154,912 GPD). PLEASE REFERENCE WASTEWATER DESIGN CALCULATION SUMMARY TABLE AND SECTION E. COMPUTATIONS OF THE BREAKDOWN OF PROPOSED AVERAGE DAY SEWER DEMAND AND PEAK FLOW.

m. Need site/utility plan. DSPM 7-1.201.

RESPONSE: SITE PLAN AND UTILITY PLAN ARE NOW PROVIDED IN THIS UPDATED WASTEWATER REPORT.

Significant Policy Related Issues

Site Design:

10. The submittal appears to be missing the Pedestrian Offsite Plan (A1.6.1) that was part of the prior case documents and showed the pedestrian routes through the overall development and the proposed pedestrian connection to be created at the north end of the site connecting to the development to the west. Please provide that information with the resubmittal.

    RESPONSE: SHEET A1.6.1 INCLUDED WITH THIS SUBMITTAL. NOTED PEDESTRIAN PATHS CONNECTING SHEA BLVD TO RETAIL/OFFICE AND MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENTS

11. Please provide loading and unloading areas in the site configuration, per DSPM. 2-1.305.F, with minimum length of 45-feet and width of 12-feet, in accordance with below tables. Please update the site plan(s) accordingly. Alleys, fire lanes, and adjacent streets shall not be used for loading and unloading.

    RESPONSE: TWO LOADING ZONES ON THE MULTI-FAMILY SIDE WERE ADDED TO THE PROJECT. ONE AT THE MAIN PARKING AREA (10FT X 18FT). THE OTHER LOCATED IN THE FIRST LEVEL PARKING GARAGE (MIN 12FT X 45FT).

12. Please revise the Refuse Plan, per DSPM 2-1.309 and the following (please contact Eliana Hayes at 480-312-2757 should you have specific questions):

A. Refuse truck will not use enhanced pedestrian pathway as it does not constitute an acceptable vehicular pathway for refuse truck purposes. Please update design so that the refuse truck can circulate through site as follows:

   a. Through a traditional vehicular corridor;
   b. In a location that does not require the refuse truck to "backtrack";
   c. So that collection vehicles do not back up more than thirty-five (35) feet; or,
   d. So that path of travel for the refuse truck accommodates a minimum vehicle of turning radius of 45 feet, and vehicle length of 40 feet.

RESPONSE: REFER TO SHEETS A1.5, A1.5.1 & A1.5.2
(A) VEHICULAR PATHWAY FOLLOWS TRADITIONAL CORRIDOR
(B) NO BACKTRACKING PROPOSED
(C) MAX 35FT BACK NEEDED
(D) ALL TURNING RADII ARE 45FT FOR A 40FT LONG VEHICLE.

B. Refuse Compactors: The Solid Waste Management Director, or designee may approve refuse compactors as an alternative to refuse or recycling containers as follows:

e. Rear Loaded Non-Residential, Mixed-Use, and Multi-Family Residential Compactor Container Positioning (rear loaded non-vertical compactors only allowable)

(1) Design the location of the refuse or recycling compactor container and loading and maneuvering area so that the container and refuse truck does not obstruct any portion of designated fire lane or an emergency and service vehicle access lane during loading, unloading, and placement of the container.

(2) 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.

(3) The vertical clearances are subject to modification based on container size, location and positioning as determined by the Sanitation Director, or designee.

(4) 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.

(5) Provide a refuse compactor container approach area that has a minimum width of fourteen (14) feet and length of sixty (60) feet in front of the container. The length of the approach is subject to modification based on the enclosure location, drainage, and positioning concerns. The approach length and width are subject to modification based on container size, location and positioning as determined by the Sanitation Director, or designee.

(6) Provide the refuse compactor container approach and storage areas with a maximum continuous slope of two (2) percent.

(7) Incorporate a concrete approach slab (minimum thirty (30) feet long) and refuse compactor container storage area concrete slab (minimum four (4) feet longer than the container) that are, at a minimum, in compliance with the concrete slab

requirements of the COS MAG Details for a refuse enclosure. The property owner and their designers are responsible for determine when a greater capacity concrete slab and structural design is required and shall modify the design indicated in the COS MAG Details to accommodate the design of the building, refuse truck, refuse compactor container, etc.

RESPONSE: REFER TO SHEETS A1.5, A1.5.1 & A1.5.2
(1) THE COMPACTOR/REFUSE IS LOCATED AT THE UPPER NORTH EAST CORNER OF THE PROPERTY OUT OF THE WAY OF THE FIRE LANES AND DRIVE AISLES
(2) NO CLEARANCE VERTICAL ISSUES, AREA AROUND AND INFRONT OF ENCLOSURE ARE OPEN TO THE AIR ABOVE
(3) NO CLEARANCE VERTICAL ISSUES, AREA AROUND AND INFRONT OF ENCLOSURE ARE OPEN TO THE AIR ABOVE
(4) REFUSE TRUCK WILL PULL HEAD IN INTO THE ENCLOSURE AND DUMP THE CONTAINERS, NO SPECIAL MANEUVERING REQUIRED
(5) 14FT BY 60FT APPROACH PROVIDED IN FRONT OF THE ENCLOSURE
(6) MAX 2% AT THE APPROACH AND ENCLOSURE FLOOR NOTED ON PLANS
(7) 30FT MINIMUM MIN APPROACH SLAB PROVIDED IN FRONT OF ENCLOSURE

13. Please update the Site Plan to show and identify a minimum 6-foot width accessible pedestrian route from the main entry of the development to each abutting public/private street that provides a pedestrian sidewalk/multi-use trail, per DSPM 2-1.310.

RESPONSE: NOTED 6FT WIDE MULTI-USE TRAIL AND PEDESTRIAN PATH ON SITE AND THROUGH RETAIL/OFFICE SITE REFER TO SHEETS A1.3 & A1.6.1

14. Please make sure project design is based on the McDOT benchmark system and in accordance with the FEMA Benchmark Maintenance criteria, per DSPM 3-1.701.I. Please update submittal documents accordingly.

RESPONSE: COMMENT NOTED; TOPO SURVEY COPY HAS BEEN INCLUDED FOR REFERENCE.

<u>Building Elevation Design:</u>

15. Per the Zoning Ordinance definition of Building Height (Sec. 3.100), the provided building height is “measured from a point of reference elevation established 12 inches above the average elevation at the top of the curb of the street or streets adjacent to the property”. The information indicated on Site Sections, Sheet A1.4, does not appear to be taking the Shea Boulevard site frontage into account and is instead referencing the use of relative grades of just the residential portion of the site. Please revise the drawings to clearly identify building heigh t will be in compliance as measured from the correct point of reference.

RESPONSE: SHEET A1.4 UPDATED, THE AVERAGE CURB HEIGHT ALONG SHEA BLVD IS 1371.70 FT, THE AVERAGE CURB HEIGHT PLUS 1FT IS 1372.70. SHEET A1.4 UPDATED

16. Please provide colored perspective(s) of the east and west project elevations. These will help visually clarify that sufficient window recess and shading are being accounted for with the

conceptual design.

RESPONSE: ADDITIONAL PERSPECTIVES ADDED TO THE RESUBMITTAL, SEE SHEET A3.2

Technical Corrections

Narrative:

17. The provided narrative identifies a Preferred Employer discount program to supplement the idea of this development establishing housing options for employees working in the surrounding area. Please look at providing more elaboration on how this type of operational program would be carried out and what documented assurances may be able to be put in place as part of this zoning application to ensure the identified program will be executed as represented.

RESPONSE: IN THIS RESUBMITTAL WE HAVE LEFT THE LANGUAGE ON THE PREFERRED EMPLOYER DISCOUNT AS WORDED. WE STAND BY THIS PROGRAM, BUT DO ACKNOWLEDGE THERE NEEDS TO BE CONTINUED DISCUSSION WITH THE CITY ON ASSURANCES FOR AND EXECUTION OF THE PROGRAM. WE WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH STAFF FOR ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION BEFORE THIS REQUEST IS PRESENTED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARINGS. WE WOULD PLAN ON ENTERING INTO A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH THE CITY AT A LATER DATE AND THE DETAILS WILL BE NEGOTIATED AT THIS TIME.

Traffic Study:

18. Please revise the Traffic Study to address the following:

    a. General – Ironwood Lane should be Ironwood Drive

       RESPONSE: CORRECTED

    b. Figure 4 – the "proposed site" callout differs from the site plan and other figures.
       RESPONSE: INCONSISTENCIES HAVE BEEN CORRECTED

    c. Page 8 and Figure 5 – the description of the eastbound approach to the driveway does not match the figure
       RESPONSE: INCONSISTENCIES HAVE BEEN CORRECTED

    d. Please limit trip generation comparison to the 0.35 FAR scenario. Assumption of potential 0.80 FAR is not supportable. Staff recommends that the site would be assumed to be 50/50 general office and medical office for comparison scenarios.
       RESPONSE: COMPARISON TABLE HAS BEEN ADJUSTED AS RECOMMENDED.

    e. Page 20 – description of AM peak hour percentage change does not match table.
       RESPONSE: INCONSISTENCIES HAVE BEEN CORRECTED

    f. Page 21 - Text describes that approximately 20% of outbound traffic would go through the existing office complex(es) to reach Ironwood Drive/Driveway E to continue south. Based on Figure 7, it does not appear that this is the case. Consider including graphic of enlarged site plan and surrounding area to show expected routes to and from the proposed 9400 site through existing developments. What route are trips entering exiting at Driveway B/Becker Lane expected to take? Staff would not support use of the drive aisle located on the eastern edge of the parcel north of the proposed site as a primary access route. The circulation plan submitted in the package shows connection to adjacent parcel to the west (Ironwood 92), but this is not addressed in the report

RESPONSE: ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION HAS BEEN ADDED IN THE DISCUSSION OF TRIP DISTRIBUTION WITH ADDITION GRAPHIC DEPICTIONS ON FIGURE 6.

g. What will be the mechanism to restrict the southern access into the existing office complex? This access is labeled as an "EXIT ONLY" but it appears trips were assigned to enter here.
RESPONSE: IT IS EXPECTED THAT A VEHICULAR GATE WILL BE PLACED AT THIS EXIT WITH A TIME CLOCK TO REGULATE THE USAGE.

Circulation:

19. The internal connection through the development project site, to and from Shea Boulevard appears to have design issues. The route width narrows to 16-feet and has limited sight distance. Please address this and any proposed changes that would correct those existing design deficiencies.

    RESPONSE: ADDED SHEET A1.6.2 NOTATING THE VARIOUS OPTIONS FOR VEHICULAR CIRCULATION PATHS. NOTED THE ONE WAY, 16FT WIDE PORTION AS NOTED IN COMMENT LETTER

20. The narrative discusses a likely vehicular connection to 92nd Street through the adjacent Ironwood/Caliber property to the west, but the site plan does not show how or where this will occur. Please revise the site plan to identify that intended connection location(s) for a more comprehensive understanding of how that interconnectivity will lay out.

    RESPONSE: THE VEHICULAR CONNECTION TO ACCESS 92ND STREET VIA IRONWOOD/CALIBER PROPERTY IS STRICTLY "EMERGENCY ACCESS DRIVE ONLY". ADDED SHEET A1.6.3 TO SHOW CIRCULATION PATH FOR EMERGENCY ACCESS

21. Please provide additional clarification on how the "exit only" vehicular gate at the southwestern corner of the site is intended to be used. Will there be any imposed time constraints, or is it intended to be available at all hours?

    RESPONSE: THE VEHICULAR CONNECTION TO ACCESS 92ND STREET VIA IRONWOOD/CALIBER PROPERTY IS STRICTLY "EMERGENCY ACCESS DRIVE ONLY". ADDED SHEET A1.6.3 TO SHOW CIRCULATION PATH FOR EMERGENCY ACCESS

22. The "public" sidewalk on the west side dead-ends into the private pedestrian facility. This appears to miss an opportunity to include a continuation on of the public component to the other access points identified further south.

    RESPONSE: THERE IS NOW A DG FIRELANE / TRAIL ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE PROJECT TO PROVIDE MUCH BETTER PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION TO THE SOUTH, WHICH MATCHES WHAT IS PROPOSED ON THE SOUTH AND WEST SIDE OF THE PROJECT AS WELL.

23. Please provide more detail for the pedestrian connection from the fire lane path to the existing

sidewalk to the south on the Ironwood Medical Office property. The fire lane gate seems to be blocking the connection and the pathway shown does not appear to connect to the existing southern improvements.

RESPONSE: THE GATE AND SIDEWALK LEADING TO THE IRONWOOD CENTER HAS BEEN BETTER DETAILED TO SHOW THE CONNECTION POINT TO THE EXISTING SIDEWALK AND CROSSWALK TO THE SOUTH OF OUR SITE.

24. The intersection at the east side of the site, joining the residential to the existing commercial, creates a complicated interaction between the main traffic flow and the pedestrian crossing. Please evaluate a revised configuration that addresses the functionality of that area.

    RESPONSE: THE CROSSWALK HAS BEEN RECONFIGURED TO BE PERPENDICULAR TO THE DRIVE ISLE UNTIL PEDESTRIANS WOULD BE OUT OF THE DRIVE PATH. IT THEN ANGLES DOWN TO THE OTHER ADA RAMP AFTER PEDESTRIANS CROSS THE PORTION THAT IS WITHIN THE DRIVE PATH. WE FEEL THIS PROVIDES MUCH BETTER VISUAL CONNECTIONS TO THE CROSSWALK FROM BOTH DIRECTIONS.

25. The skews and offsets in travel lanes for the garage entrance and main access aisle design appear to create turning conflicts and sight distance issues. Please evaluate a revised configuration that addresses these design concerns.

    RESPONSE: THE CURRENT DESIGN ALLOWS FOR THE GARAGE ENTRY TO BE LINED UP WITH THE EXISTING DRIVE AISLE TO THE NORTH. A GATE WAS ADDED TO THE WEST SIDE DRIVE AISLE WHICH IS ONLY ACCESSIBLE TO FIRE DEPORTMENT AND APARTMENT PERSONNEL. ALL ACCESS AISLES ARE TREATED LIKE A TYPICAL PARKING LOT. ADDING GATE WILL REMOVE TURNING CONFLICTS

26. The following stipulations of previous cases 6-GP-2019 & 16-ZN-2019 should continue to be accounted for with the current application. Please ensure your proposal accounts for and includes the following stipulated parameters:

    RESPONSE: WHILE SOME OF THE PARAMETERS AND CONDITIONS SURROUNDING THE PRIOR CASE REMAIN THE SAME WITH THIS CURRENT CASE, THERE HAS ALSO BEEN SIGNIFICANT CHANGES AS IT RELATES TO COORDINATION AND ACCESS WITH THE ADJACENT PROPERTIES. WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THERE BE A CONVERSATION ABOUT THE INCLUSION OF THESE PRIOR STIPULATIONS INTO THE CURRENT APPLICATION BEFORE THE STAFF REPORT IS PUBLISHED.

    a. PUBLIC ACCESS EASEMENT. The city reserves the existing blanket public access easement over all existing and proposed pedestrian and vehicle access ways within the development project. Prior to any permit issuance for new construction, the owner shall dedicate to the City a minimum twenty-six (26) foot-wide continuous Public Access Easement along and abutting the west property line of the residential development, with a minimum twenty-four (24) foot wide continuous Public Access Easement continuing through the property to the E. Shea Boulevard entry drive.

b. RESTRICTED ACCESS TO SOUTH. Vehicular access to/from the south shall be restricted to exit only. There shall be no construction access to/from the south.

c. SHARED FIRE LANE. At such time that shared access is provided to 92nd Street to the west, the shared fire lane on the west side as shown on the Development Plan shall not include walls or fences on either side of this fire lane.

d. TRAFFIC SIGNAL PARTICIPATION. At such time that shared access is provided to 92nd Street to the west, the property owner shall participate in half of the construction cost of any warranted traffic signal at the 92nd Street and Cochise Drive intersection.

e. CROSS ACCESS EASEMENT. Prior to issuance of any permit for the development project, the property owner shall dedicate cross access easements, across and to the benefit of all parcels contained within development project.

f. EMERGENCY AND SERVICE VEHICLE ACCESS EASEMENT. Prior to any permit issuance for new construction of the development project, the owner shall dedicate to the City a continuous Emergency and Service Vehicle Access Easement over the portions of the development project designated as Fire Lanes. The final surface treatment of the fire lanes shall be subject to approval by the City of Scottsdale Fire Marshall, or designee.

g. FIRE LANE. With the Development Review Board submittal, the property owner shall provide a minimum twenty-four (24) foot fire lane shall surround the residential building with a minimum twenty-four (24) foot wide surface area on the north and west side, and at the fire staging areas on the south and east sides. The surface area width along the south and east sides shall be reduced to a minimum of sixteen (16) feet and maximum of twenty (20) feet outside of the fire staging areas to accommodate a minimum of four (4) feet and a maximum of six (6) feet for landscaping (no trees), subject to approval by the City of Scottsdale Fire Marshall.

h. STREETLIGHT POLES. All existing lighting fixtures on streetlights adjacent to the property's street frontage shall be replaced.

i. PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS. With the Development Review Board submittal, the property owner shall provide plans showing pedestrian improvements through the property providing new pedestrian cross access at the northwest corner of the property as shown on the Development Plan. All pedestrian walkways shall be a minimum of six (6) feet wide and ADA accessible, to the extent possible.
   (1) The new opening in the wall along the northwest property line shall be a minimum twelve feet wide.

(2) The existing thirty-four (34) foot wide driveway/loading zoning shall be reduced to a minimum of twenty (20) foot fire lane, curbing, minimum six (6) foot wide walkway, and landscaping, subject to approval by the City of Scottsdale Fire Marshall.

j. PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS: All new pedestrian crossings at driveways within the development project shall be enhanced pavement treatment and/or raised, subject to Development Review Board approval.

k. SITE ACCESS. Access to the site via the existing public access easements shall not be restricted or blocked by the property owner or building tenants on the site unless the easement is released or modified by the City of Scottsdale.

l. CONSTRUCTION ACCESS. Construction access shall not be routed through adjacent properties utilizing existing public access easements; construction access shall only be through the site to Shea Boulevard.

m. INTERNAL PARKING AISLES. All existing and proposed internal parking aisles shall be a minimum of 24 feet in width (excluding any curb and gutter); parking aisles that are less than 24 feet in width shall be designated as one-way travel.

Civil Improvements and Platting:

27. Please acknowledge that no soil nails or tie back construction systems, may protrude past project property lines, per SRC Ch.47.

RESPONSE: COMMENT NOTED; NO SOIL NAILS OR RETENTION SYSTEMS ARE UNDER CURRENT CONSIDERATION.

28. Per the land division code SRC Ch.48, please be advised and acknowledge, the following:

A. Platting is the only city method for modifying parcel boundaries. Project's proposed zoning boundary is, today, comprised of 3 parcels – APNs 217-36-001M, 217-36-001N, 217-36-001P. These 3 lots originate from one platted parent parcel, MCR 630-20. The city has no record of a plat, or any other form of city approval, having created the now 3 parcels. Platting of all 3 parcels (to establish parcels' boundaries) will be required prior to permit issuance.

RESPONSE: COMMENT NOTED; PLAT APPROVAL WILL BE PURSUED PRIOR TO PERMIT ISSUANCE.

B. Through the required plat, APN 217-36-001N will need to be assembled into one of the 2 larger parcels.

RESPONSE: COMMENT NOTED; RE-SUBDIVISION WORK WILL BE COORDINATED UNDER THE PLAT REVIEW PROCESS.

C. Through the required plat, blanket easements, having been dedicated via same parent parcel creating plat - MCR 630-20, may be modified to better reflect and coincide with physical improvements.

RESPONSE: COMMENT NOTED; RE-SUBDIVISION WORK WILL BE COORDINATED UNDER THE PLAT REVIEW PROCESS.

Water Report – General Comments:

Pg. 4, C. Existing Conditions, 4. Fire Flow Results
Comment: See comments on Hydrant Test Page.

An updated hydrant flow test report conducted on May 20th, 2022, has been provided. Please reference Exhibit 5: *Hydrant Flow Test Report* of the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report.

Pg. 8, F. Summary, Table 4.0 – Demand Comparison: Existing Development vs. Proposed Development
Comment: What is the pressure at the highest finished floor at the worst-case location? DSPM 6-1.202.G.6.c.ii

Please reference the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report for updated pressure.

Comment: Demonstrate minimum domestic service pressure of 50 psi can be maintained at the highest proposed finished floor elevation for the worst hydraulic case domestic demand node. See Model Scenario 4 requirements, DSPM 6-1.202.G.6.d.

Please reference the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report for updated pressure.

Pg. 2, Scenario 1 – Minimum Residual Pressure – Average Day Demand
Comment: ADD is 140 gpm, not 43.34 gpm. The modeling does not demonstrate the resultant pressures at the highest finished floor elevation at ADD. 6-1.202.G. The network diagram does not show the demand node associated with the fire sprinkler riser connection. DPSM 6-1.202.H.1D.

The water model has been updated to reflect accurate domestic and fire demands.

Comment: Need output with velocities and head loss rates for each modeling scenario DSPM 6-1.202.H.3

The model links (pipes) have been added to the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report for reference.

Pg. 2, Scenario 2 – Maximum Static Pressure – Peak Hour Demand
Comment: PHD is 490 gpm, not 151.69 gpm. The modeling does not demonstrate the resultant pressures at the highest finished floor elevation at PDD. DSPM 6-1.202.G, DSPM 1.406. The network diagram does not show the demand node associated with the fire sprinkler riser connection. DSPM 6-1.202.H.1.d.

The water model has been updated to reflect accurate domestic and fire demands.

Comment: Need output with velocities and head loss rates for each modeling scenario DSPM 6-1.202.H.3

The model links (pipes) have been added to the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report for reference.

Pg. 2, Scenario 3 – Minimum Pressure – Maximum Day Demand with Fire Flow
Comment: Modeling Scenario 3 flows are 2280 gpm, not 2086 gpm. DSPM 6-1.202.G, DSPM 1.406. The network diagram does not show the demand node associated with the fire sprinkler riser connection. DSPM 6-1.202.H.1.d.

The water model has been updated to reflect accurate domestic and fire demands.

Comment: Need output with velocities and head loss rates for each modeling scenario DSPM 6-1.202.H.3

The model links (pipes) have been added to the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report for reference.

Pg. 2, Scenario 4 – Maximum Head loss – Maximum Day Demand (Network Table – Nodes)
Comment: MDD is 280 gpm, not 86.68 gpm. DSPM 6-1.202.G. The modeling does not demonstrate the resultant pressures at the highest finished floor elevation at MDD meet the requirements of DSPM 1.406. The network diagram does not show the demand node associated with the fire sprinkler riser connection. DSPM 6-1.202.H.1.d.

The water model has been updated to reflect accurate domestic and fire demands.

Pg. 1, Scenario 4 – Maximum Head loss – Maximum Day Demand (Network Table – Links)
Comment: MDD is 280 gpm, not 86.68 gpm. DSPM 6-1.202.G.

The water model has been updated to reflect accurate domestic and fire demands.

Pg. 1, Hydrant Flow Test Report
Comment: Need current flow test. DSPM 6-1.202.2.

The updated hydrant flow test report conducted on May 20th, 2022, has been provided. Please reference Exhibit 5: *Hydrant Flow Test Report* of the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report.

Comment: Reduce GPM by 10%. DSPM 6-1.405.B.1

Calculation has been added to Exhibit 5: *Hydrant Flow Test Report* of the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report.

Comment: Recalculate with adjusted GPM above

Calculation has been added to Exhibit 5: *Hydrant Flow Test Report* of the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report.

Comment: Include supply curves. DSPM 6-1.202.G.

The supply curve has been added to the end of Exhibit 5: *Hydrant Flow Test Report* of the Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report.

Pg. 1, Preliminary Water Line Plan
Comment: Reference 'Overall Water Line Plan" exhibit.

Reference comment responses on "Overall Water Line Plan" exhibit.

Wastewater Report – General Comments:

Pg. 4, E. Computations, 2. Average Day Sewer Demand and Peak Flow for Proposed Development
Comment: 219 Units per submittal.

219 Units is the correct number of units provided in this report. The wastewater demand (140 gpd/unit) for high density was found on figure 7-1.2 COS DSPM.

Comment: 13,784 sf per submittal.

In section E. Computations, the calculations have been updated to show the 13,784 sf for clubhouse area.

Comment: Use a flat 100 gpd for pool in absence of site-specific calculations.

In section E. Computations, the demand for proposed pool is 100 gpd with a peaking factor of 4 to compute peak flow.

Pg. 1, Preliminary Sanitary Sewer Plan
Comment: On-site private sewer is not discharging to City sewer, discharging to private sewer. Provide information how this project complies with SRC Sec 49-118.

Alternatively, could discharge to sewer in 92nd St., obtain private sewer easement on vacant to City sewer (discussed during 286-PA-2022).

The Blanket Easement states: Shea hereby grants and conveys to Kaplan, for the benefit of Kaplan, the Kaplan Property, and Kaplan's successors and assigns, a perpetual, non-exclusive easement for the construction, installation, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, relocation and removal of facilities and systems for utility services serving any part of the Kaplan Property (the "Shea Utility Easements"), with such services including without limitation electricity, telephone, television, other telecommunications, fiber optics, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, water, and gas and with such facilities and systems including without limitation cables, conduits, pipes, mains, manholes, meters, hydrants, transformers, and risers.

Shea's Utility Easements document will be provided upon recordation with the City of Scottsdale.

Pg. 1, Wastewater Demand Calculations
Comment: Need to include commercial flows, pool, etc. as per comments on section G of this BOD.

The combined flows for apartment, clubhouse, and pool are computed to show an average daily flow (36,274 gpd) and peak daily flow (154,912 gpd). Please reference Wastewater Design Calculation Summary table and Section E. Computations of the breakdown of proposed average day sewer demand and peak flow.

Comment: Need site/utility plan as per DSPM 7-1.201.

All utilities are shown in each report. Site Plan and Utility Plan are now provided in this updated Wastewater Report.