10-7-22 RESPONSES

Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues

Water and Wastewater:

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

   WATER:

   a. Reduce all measured fire hydrant test flows by 10% for all modeling scenarios per DSPM 6-1.405.B.1.
   b. Use static pressure values reduced by 10% for all modeling scenarios per DSPM 6- 1.405.B.5.b.
   c. Identify pressure at the highest finished floor at the worst case location (Scenario 3) DSPM 6-1.202.G.6.c.ii.
   d. 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:

A. All measured fire hydrant test flows have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

B. The static pressure values have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

C. The pressured has been identified for the most remote location and elevation of 1,429.7 MSEL. Please reference attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

D. Minimum domestic service pressure has been identified as 48 PSI without the 10% reduction. While the PSI is 2 below the minimum required, we are still within a 5% design variance threshold.

WASTEWATER REPORT:

Pg. 7, Use 100 gpm for average and peak values in absence of site-specific information.

The average and peak values for "Pool" demand have been updated. Please reference the *Preliminary Basis of Design Wastewater Report* pages 4 and 5.

WATER REPORT:

Pg. 21 and 26, Use hydrant test static pressure that is reduced by 10% (64.8 psi) as input for all model scenarios per DSPM 6-1.405.B.5.b.

The static pressure values have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 42, Use reduced pressure value per DSPM 6-1.405.B.5.b

The static pressure values have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 42, Use static pressure values reduced by 10% per DSPM 6-1.405.B.5.b

The static pressure values have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 42, Use 10% reduced flow value per DSPM 6-1.405B.1.

All measured fire hydrant test flows have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 42, Fire flow required residual pressure at hydrant is 30 psi per DSPM 6-1.406.C

The required residual pressure at hydrant has been updated to reflect 30 PSI. Please reference the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 43, Reduce all measured test flows by 10% per DSPM 6-1.405.B.1

All measured fire hydrant test flows have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 43, Use static pressure values reduced by 10% per DSPM 6-1.405.B.5.b

The static pressure values have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 44, Reduce all measured test flows by 10% per DSPM 6-1.405.B.1

All measured fire hydrant test flows have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 44, Use static pressure values reduced by 10% per DSPM 6-1.405.B.5.b

The static pressure values have been reduced by 10%. Please reference Scenarios 1-4 and the hydrant flow test report in attachment five of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report* appendix.

Pg. 46, Reduce Pressure Principal backflow preventer required per SRC 49-62(a)(25).

The backflow preventer has been updated to a reduce pressure principal type. Please reference the overall water line plan exhibit in attachment six of the *Preliminary Basis of Design Water Report appendix.*

Significant Policy Related Issues

Site Design:

2. 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.

a. This does not appear to be fully addressed with the resubmittal. Both Loading Zones are required to be 45-feet by 12-feet. Please also provide truck maneuvering dimensions into and out of the parking garage loading area.

RESPONSE: TWO 45FT BY 12FT MIN LOADING ZONES PROVIDED INSIDE FIRST LEVEL OF PARKING GARAGE.

3. 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):

   Please update the Refuse Plan as follows:

   a. Identify the location of the refuse compactor in a graphic
   b. Define how refuse gets from the units to the compactor.
   c. Remove the note regarding multiple container pick up, and size the horizontal compactor to preclude this.
   d. Demonstrate that:
      (1) There is a 14-foot by 60-foot approach provided in front of the enclosure
      (2) There is a maximum 2% slope at the approach and enclosure floor.

RESPONSE:

A. COMPACTOR AND REFUSE ARE NOTED AND SHOWN ON THE TO SITE PLANS AND REFUSE PLAN, THEY ARE LOCATED AT NORTH EAST CORNER OF SITE

B. A TRASH CHUTE IS LOCATED AT EACH FLOOR LEVEL, REFER TO THE NOTCH AT THE NORTH WEST CORNER OF THE GARAGE. THE CUTE TERMINATES INSIDE A TRASH ROOM WHERE MAINTENANCE STAFF WILL TRANSPORT AND DISPOSE OF IT INSIDE THE COMPACTOR/REFUSE ENCLOSURE (NOTED ON SHEET A1.5.1) COLLECTION NOTE NARRATIVE UPDATED ON SHEET A1.5.

C. NOTE REMOVED FROM COLLECTION NOTE BOX ON SHEET A1.5

D. NOTED 14FT BY 60 FT APPROACH AND MAX 2% SLOPE ON SHEET A1.5.1

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:
   e. Through a traditional vehicular corridor;
   f. In a location that does not require the refuse truck to “backtrack”;
   g. So that collection vehicles do not back up more than thirty-five (35) feet; or,
   h. 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: THE ENHANCED PATHWAY WILL NOT BE USED TO STAGE OR LOAD THE TRUCK

E. A TRADITIONAL PATH IS FOLLOWED AND SHOWN ON SHEET A1.5.2.
REFUSE ENCLOSURE WAS REPOSITION TO ALL FOR COLLECTION WHICH WILL FOLLOW THE EXISTING PATH FOR THE OFFICE/RETAIL SITE TO THE NORTH
COMPACTOR WILL ALSO FOLLOW THE SAME OFFICE/RETAIL PATH BUT THE TRUCK WIL BACKUP TO COMPACTOR AND REMOVE SAID COMPACTOR FOLLOWING THE SAME PATH NOTED ON SHEET A1.5.2

F. NO “BACKTRACK” NEEDED AS THE TRUCK WILL FOLLOW THE TRADITIONAL PATH SHOWN ON THE PLAS

G. MINIMAL BACK UP IS ONLY NEEDED WHEN ACCESSING OR LEAVING THE ENCLOSURE
H. MINIMUM TURNING RADIUS NOTED ON PLANS (SHEETS A1.5.1 & A1.5.2)

B. Refuse Compactors: The Solid Waste Management Director, or designee may approve refuse compactors as an alternative to refuse or recycling containers as follows:
   i. Rear Loaded Non-Residential, Mixed-Use, and Multi-Family Residential Compactor Container Positioning (rear loaded non-vertical compactors only)
      (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.

      RESPONSE: REFUSE/COMPACTOR ACCESS AREAS ARE OUT OF THE FIRE LANES. FIRE LANES ARE SHOWN AROUND THE BUILDING. THE ENCLOSURE APPROACHES ARE OUTSIDE OF SAID FIRE LANES

      (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.

      RESPONSE: AS SHOWN ON SHEET A1.5.2 NO OVERHEAD OBSTRUCTIONS AREA PROPOSED AS THE VEHICLE WILL MANEUVER AROUND THE SITE AWAY FROM ANY ISSUES

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

      RESPONSE: NO OVERHEAD VERTICAL CLEARANCES ISSUES

      (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.

      RESPONSE: TRUCK WILL PICK UP FULL COMPACTOR FROM THE COMPACTOR ENCLOSURE WITHOUT THE NEED TO RELOCATE IT. TRUCK WILL BACK UP TO ENCLOSURE PICK IT UP AND LEAVE

      (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.

      RESPONSE:14X60 APPROACH PROVIDED AND NOTED ON REFUSE PLANS

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

RESPONSE: MAXIMUM 2% SLOPE NOTED ON REFUSE PLANS

(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: A 30FT MINIMUM CONCRETE APRON NOTED ON REFUSE PLANS

Technical Corrections

Traffic Study:

4. Please revise the Traffic Study to address the following:
   a. Text still describes vehicles traveling south from the site to travel south on 92nd Street from Ironwood Square Drive, but assignment shows traffic going north from this intersection. The "secondary route" shown veers off to join the "primary route" yet the site plan shows there will be an access point in line with Driveway B/Becker Lane. As before, Staff would not support the use of the drive aisle located on the eastern edge of the parcel north of the proposed site. Also, the access scenario in the TIMA does not appear to match other documents in the submittal.

RESPONSE: REPORT TEXT WAS UPDATED TO ACCURATELY DEPICT WHAT IS SHOWN IN FIGURE 6 (TRIP DISTRIBUTION) AND FIGURE 7 (SITE TRAFFIC VOLUMES). ACCESS SCENARIO WAS UPDATED TO MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN IN THE SUBMITTAL DOCUMENTS.

   b. Repeat comment – a right turn lane is being constructed on Shea Boulevard at Driveway (2). Please use this in the analysis. The figure was correct in first submittal (dedicated right-turn lane), but the text described it as a shared through/right. The figure/analysis now shows it incorrectly and is still incorrectly identified in text.

RESPONSE: TEXT ON THE RIGHT TURN LANE ON THE ADJACENT PARCEL'S SHEA DRIVEWAY HAS BEEN CORRECTED.

   c. Page 19 – Staff would allow such trip comparison to be made, however we question the use of the term "entitled" as noted in text with proposals to redevelop these parcels with mixed-use/residential. We agree with the assumption that the land use and FAR be used for the comparison.

RESPONSE: THE TERM "ENTITLED" HAS BEEN REMOVED WHEN DISCUSSION THE TRIP COMPARISON WITH THE EXISTING ZONING.

d. Previous conversations regarding redevelopment of this property included collaboration with adjacent parcel (Ironwood 92/Ironwood Partners property) to facilitate better access into the site. This case is likely to receive similar comments as the previous 16-ZN-2019 which was withdrawn by the applicant. The parcel to the west was recently resubmitted. Please contact staff and include the adjacent parcel in the analysis. Staff would prefer an agreement to be made to allow access to 92nd Street.

RESPONSE: WE HAVE ADDED A STATEMENT TO THE ANALYSIS NOTING THE POTENTIAL FOR ACCESS TO 92ND STREET THROUGH THE ADJACENT PARCEL. WE EXPECT CONTINUED DISCUSSION WITHIN THE ZONING CASES FOR THIS AND THE ADJACENT PROPERTY RELATED TO THIS ACCESS. GIVEN THAT THE ACCESS EASEMENT IS NOT GUARANTEED THROUGH THE ADJACENT PARCEL TO 92ND STREET, WE HAVE NOT ACCOUNTED FOR IT IN THE ANALYSIS.

e. The main site driveway along the "primary route" is poorly aligned with the garage entry. There appears to be poor site distance for vehicles exiting the garage. Staff would prefer the drive aisles are aligned and perpendicular to the internal site loop roadway.

RESPONSE: THE GARAGE ENTRY HAS A MINOR SKEW TO THE LOOP ROADWAY. WHEN A VEHICLE LEAVES SAID GARAGE, THEY WILL HAVE CLEAR VIEW OF THE PARKING AREAS AND DRIVE AISLES TO THE NORTH AND WEST. THE AREA TO THE EAST IS GATED AND NOT ACCESSIBLE TO NORMAL VEHICLE MANEUVERING. WE DO NOT SEE ANY ISSUES WITH THIS LAYOUT

Circulation:

5. 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: SHEET A1.6.3 SHOWS A LOCATION FOR THIS CONNECTION. "THE ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER, CALIBER DEVELOPMENT, HAS DEDICATED A VEHICULAR ACCESS EASEMENT FROM THE SUBJECT PROPERTY THROUGH THEIR PROPERTY TO 92ND STREET THAT, IF IT COMES TO FRUITION, WOULD PROVIDE THIS ADDITIONAL ACCESS POINT. HOWEVER, THIS EASEMENT IS CONDITIONED UPON THE SUCCESSFULNESS OF THEIR PENDING REZONING APPLICATION. AS SUCH, IT IS NOT RELIED UPON NOR CAN IT BE FORMALLY IDENTIFIED."

6. 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: THIS IS A TYPICAL PEDESTRIAN CROSSING IN A PARKING LOT, LOW SPEEDS. THE DESIGN ALLOWS FOR ON COMING TRAFFIC TO SEE PEDESTRIANS FROM ALL DIRECTIONS. WE DO NOT SEE THIS AS AN ISSUE

7. 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 GARAGE ENTRY HAS A MINOR SKEW TO THE MAIN ACCESS DESIGN. WHEN A VEHICLE LEAVES SAID GARAGE, THEY WILL HAVE CLEAR VIEW OF THE PARKING AREAS AND DRIVE AISLES TO THE NORTH AND WEST. THE AREA TO THE EAST IS GATED AND NOT ACCESSIBLE TO NORMAL VEHICLE MANEUVERING. THIS IS A LOW-SPEED PARKING/DRIVE AISLE, WE DO NOT SEE ANY ISSUES WITH THIS LAYOUT

8. Provide more detail regarding the proposed parking lot connection to the adjacent commercial center to the west shown on the Vehicular Circulation graphic. The connection is noted as a minimum 12-feet wide; the minimum two-way paved width must be 20-feet. There is also a "path" connection shown which should be accounted for in the overall opening width.

    a. If a parking lot connection is provided to the adjacent commercial center, a deceleration lane will be required for the existing Shea Boulevard driveway.

RESPONSE: CONNECTION TO THE ADJACENT COMMERCIAL IS CONTINUED TO BE DESIGNED AND UPDATE; HOWEVER, WE HAVE UPDATED WIDTH TO NOTE MIN 20FT WIDE AND UPDATED CIVIL PLANS.

9. The site plan shows a one-way aisle on the connection to Shea Boulevard adjacent to the existing shopping center. Please clarify how will this one-way operation work. It has two-way parking aisles leading up to it in both directions.

RESPONSE: THE EXISTING DRIVE AISLE ALLOWS FOR VEHICLES TO TRAVEL IN EITHER NORTH OR SOUTH DIRECTION AS LONG AS NO OTHER VEHICLE IS USING IT IN THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION. WE WILL CONTINUE TO USE IN A SIMILAR MANNER

10. The site access proposed on the site plan and circulation plans does not match the access analyzed in the traffic impact study. The connection to the adjacent shopping center is not shown in the TIA, and the TIA still says the access to the south is time of day restricted. Please revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: THE CIRCULATION ON THE SITE PLAN ANTICIPATES THE POTENTIAL FOR A CONNECTION WITH THE ADJACENT COMMERCIAL; HOWEVER, THAT ACCESS IS NOT GUARANTEED, AS SUCH IT WAS NOT USED IN THE TIA. WE CONTINUE TO AGREE TO RESTRICTING THE ACCESS TO THE SOUTH AND ARE HOPEFUL FOR OTHER ACCESS OPPORTUNITIES SO THAT IT COULD BE FURTHER RESTRICTED TO JUST FOR EMERGENCY INGRESS AND EGRESS.

Civil Improvements and Platting:

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

RESPONSE: NO SOILS NAILS OR TIE BACK CONSTRUCTION SYSTEMS ARE EXPECTED AT THIS TIME FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE PRELIMINARY BASIS OF DESIGNER REPORTS.