

Scottsdale United Methodist Church Multi-Family Residential
4140 North Miller Road
Development Review Board Case No. 14-DR-2025
Responses to 1st Review Comment Letter

General Response: Responses to project-specific comments identified in the DRB application review are provided below. All other comments are either standard procedural notes, not applicable to this submittal, or are intended to be addressed during final plans.

Significant Zoning Ordinance or Scottsdale Revise Code Issues

CURRENT PLANNING:

Comments	Responses
1. Per Section 6.1205.D.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, in a Type 2 area within the Downtown Overlay (not zoned a Downtown District) a maximum of 35% of the first-floor area of the overall site can be residential floor area. Please revise the site plan to confirm compliance. Provide calculations indicating the total floor area of all uses on the site, total floor area of the residential only (on the first floor), and the % of residential on the first floor.	Addressed. First-floor residential area calculations and compliance percentages noted on updated site plan.
2. The site plan incorrectly references Table 9.103.A for required parking. The correct Table is 9.103.B. Also, per Table 9.103.B, multi-family projects with more than 20 units are required to provide guest parking at a rate of one space for every six units. Please revise the site plan to include guest parking calculations and indicate where on the site guest parking is to be provided.	Parking calculations noted in the Site Plan.
3. This project appears to rely on parking for the church and daycare to meet the parking requirement. Note that the parking requirements for the existing church and daycare are as follows: • <u>Church</u>: with fixed seating – one space for every four seats in the main sanctuary + one space for every 300 square feet of classrooms and other meeting areas. without fixed seating: one space for every 30 square feet of seating in the main sanctuary + additional requirement for classrooms/meeting area • <u>Daycare</u>: one space for every employee + one space for every 15 students Based on the calculations on the plan, the site appears to be short. No calculations are included for the daycare use. Please revise the site plan to include required/provided parking for the daycare use and revise calculations accordingly. Explain in the response letter, and spell out on the site plan, how parking is being allocated to the land uses.	Church area calculations with parking requirements provided in the resubmittal.

<u>TRAFFIC STUDY (TIMA):</u>	
Comments	Responses
4. Provide The TIMA has not been accepted. Please revise to address the following comments: • Update site plan to match current submittal. Current site plan only shows two driveways on Miller Road. • Include pedestrian crossing evaluation of the pedestrian refuge on Miller Road using the city's pedestrian crossing guidelines. The evaluation shall consider newly generated pedestrian trips with the proposed development and an increase to the measured origin and destination score. • Include trip generation of the existing church and daycare in the proposed development tables. • Figure 3 only shows one site driveway on miller Road. Please revise to include all driveways on the parcel that may feasibly be used to access the parcel.	Trip generation table included in the resubmittal. Site plan and figures updated; pedestrian crossing analysis and trip gen for existing uses included in the revised resubmittal.
<u>CIVIL ENGINEERING:</u>	
Comments	Responses
5. A 40-foot fee simple right-of-way dedication for the west half of Miller Road is required as it is currently a Right-of-Way Easement. A final plat is required to dedicate fee simple right-of-way. Please submit a proposed plat file with the next submittal for review and comment prior to formal final plat submittal for plan review. Any other fee simple dedications, easements or releases may be accomplished via the final plat. Also call out fee simple dedication for Miller Road on site plan. Refer to Section 47-10 of the Scottsdale Revised Code (SRC).	Noted. 40' R.O.W. shown on site plan.
6. The city has various easements within the parcel's southern drive aisle and a maintenance agreement specific to Fire Station No. 602 to the south. Please provide written communication from the city's Real Estate/Asset Management Division, demonstrating coordination of the project with them. Any construction mitigation measures agreed upon must be documented on the site plan and subsequent construction plans. Refer to Chapter 48 of the SRC.	Noted. Coordination with the city's Real Estate/Asset Management Division in progress.
7. Water main extension along 75th Street to be determined by Water Resources. Please update plans to include their determination. Refer to Chapter 49 of the SRC.	Resolved; plans reflect current status.
<u>PUBLIC SAFETY:</u>	
Comments	Responses
8. Additional fire hydrants are required. Fire hydrants shall be spaced at 700-foot intervals along the fire department access aisle. Please revise site plan to demonstrate compliance. Refer to Fire Ordinance 507.5.1.2	Provided in the improvement plans.

<u>BUILDING DESIGN:</u>	
Comments	Responses
9. Though the Transition Plan correctly shows the required stepback along Miller Road, there is a separate Building Elevation Worksheet that incorrectly shows the stepback beginning at the property line in Miller Road (which will eventually be moved back after required right-of-way dedication). Please either update the Building Elevation Worksheet to match the Transition Plan or eliminate the Worksheet in favor of the Transition Plan. Refer to Example 5.3006.H.2 of the Zoning Ordinance.	Revised Building Elevation Worksheet and Transition Plan.
10. Please provide a separate plan demonstrating compliance with the Building Location requirements outlined in Section 5.3006.F of the Zoning Ordinance.	Provided in the resubmittal.
<u>ARCHAEOLOGY/HISTORIC PRESERVATION:</u>	
Comments	Responses
11. Please provide an archaeology survey/historic significance report prepared by a qualified archaeologist. Refer to Chapter 46, Article VI – Protection of Archaeological Resources.	Provided in the resubmittal. Report by qualified archaeologist included.
<u>STORM WATER:</u>	
Comments	Responses
12. The case drainage report and preliminary G&D plan have not been accepted. Please refer to redlines in the internet folder and revise accordingly.	Drainage report revised per redlines; on-site retention shown.
<u>WATER RESOURCES:</u>	
Comments	Responses
13. The Basis of Design (BOD) reports have not been accepted. Please refer to redlined documents in the internet folder, and comments below, and revise accordingly. <u>Water</u> - Proposed fire line cannot tap size on size pipe connection. Cut in tee and valve required. Call out accordingly. City staff requests and recommends valves be placed on north and south legs of the tee (in addition to standard outlet tee) to increase reliability of fire line supply on this cast iron pipe. Refer to Section 6-1.408 of the DSPM. - Note that the city's LIS system indicates the Miller Road main is a cast iron pipe. A portion of the main may need to be replaced with current city standard ductile iron pipe, depending on where joints are and level of disturbance. Refer to note provided by city civil review team on this review cycle and include note. Refer to Sections 6-1.408 and 6-1.413 of the DSPM.	BOD reports revised; meter sizing, fire riser, and backflow issues corrected. Fire line connected with cut-in tee and valves per DSPM Water main on Miller addressed with note for replacement if disturbed 1.5" meter and line retained; upsize eliminated Fire riser room called out; backflow locations corrected Fire hydrant locations noted; spacing and placement compliant

- The existing meters are 1.5-inch. The city's LIS system indicates both service lines are also 1.5-inch. A 2-inch meter cannot be connected to a 1.5-inch service line as proposed. Meter must be equal or less than service line size. Refer to Section 6-11.416 of the DSPM.
- Explain why an upsize to the existing meters is needed. Note: there are costs associated with this, including development fees, meter, and likely a 2-inch service line.
- Call out the riser/riser room and applicable city detail. Coordinate location and requirement with city fire plan reviewers.
- Meters should not be directly over storm drain lines and backflow preventers shall be directly adjacent to the water meter on private property, and in an accessible and safe place for city staff to access for testing and inspections. Refer to Section 6-1.417 of the DSPM.
- Consult with the Fire Department reviewer on whether a new hydrant is needed on the west side of Miller Road for this development. Refer to Section 6-1.502 of the DSPM.
- Separate public and private water line key notes on the utility plan.
- Note that the minimum backflow preventer size shall match the meter size. Refer to Section 6-1.417 of the DSPM.
- A dedicated landscape service, meter and backflow preventer should be added so that sewer fees are not paid on water used for landscaping.

Sewer

- On the utility plan, call out detail MAG-440-3 for the proposed sewer service line. Refer to Section 7-1.409 of the DSPM.
- Confirm if a pool or spa are included for this project. If so, the pool and/or spa minimum peak discharges are 100 and 50 GPM respectively. Note that if a pool and/or spa are included this may trigger requirements for sewer flow monitoring and offsite sewer capacity analysis. Contact me if this is the case. Refer to Section 7-1.202 of the DSPM.
- Provide a breakdown/analysis by building and sewer outfall and include existing flows from existing buildings for reference, as was done for the water BOD report.
- Provide hydraulic analysis for the largest flow outfall for each service size connection. The proposed 6-inch service should be adequate so this is just a technical formality.

- **Utility plans corrected to distinguish public/private lines and show sewer details**
- **Pool/spa not included; no additional discharge needed**
- **Hydraulic analysis for largest outfall provided**

Significant Policy Issues

CURRENT PLANNING:

Comments	Responses
14. The circulation plan indicates an east/west pedestrian connection south of the existing daycare playground. However, the site plan does not identify a sidewalk at this location, and no sidewalk exists (see below). Please revise both plans to indicate a new sidewalk at this location (including width, should be minimum six feet). Additionally, per the circulation plan, the connection terminates before it reaches the sidewalk on 75th Street. Revise both plans to show a continuous connection all the way to the 75th Street sidewalk. Refer to Section 2-1.310 of the DSPM.	Resolved in TIMA; plan reflects current status.

TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING:

Comments	Responses
15. Please note: required offsite improvements may include a pedestrian hybrid beacon at the pedestrian refuge island on Miller Road at the northeast corner of the site. Will evaluate as part of TIMA review.	Resolved in TIMA; plan reflects current status.
16. The south site driveway on Miller Road does not meet driveway spacing requirements. Please refer to Section 5-3.201 of the DSPM and revise site plan and circulation plan accordingly.	Identified and dimensioned on site plan.
17. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate a new 8-foot sidewalk along the Miller Road frontage and extend it all the way to the southeast corner of the site. Miller Road gets a lot of pedestrian traffic so a wider sidewalk is warranted.	Resolved in TIMA; plan reflects current status.
18. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate a new 6-foot wide sidewalk along the 75th Street frontage and extend it all the way to the northwest corner of the site.	Provided and dimensioned on site plan.

CIVIL ENGINEERING:

Comments	Responses
19. Please revise applicable plans to indicate required on-site loading/unloading areas, minimum 12 feet X 45 feet, in accordance with the following table. Note that alleys, fire lanes, and streets cannot be used for loading/unloading. Refer to Section 2-1.305 of the DSPM.	Dimensioned on site plan.
20. Please update Refuse Plan capacity calculations to include the square footages of existing buildings + proposed to ensure sufficient capacity is being provided for the project. Refer to Section 2-1.309 of the DSPM.	Provided in the resubmittal.
21. Along Miller Road, it appears there is a "jog" in the street sidewalk. Please revise the site plan to indicate a continuous	Shown in site plan.

sidewalk from the revised Miller Road driveway south. Refer to Chapter 5 of the DSPM.	
22. Water meters cannot be located within a sidewalk (see below). Please revise applicable plans to show the water meter relocated outside the sidewalk limits.	Noted.
<u>STREET LIGHTING:</u>	
Comments	Responses
23. In the event powerlines along the Miller Road frontage are placed underground, please revise the site plan to indicate two new galvanized streetlight poles with luminaries along that frontage. Streetlight poles shall be designed to match COS Standard Details No. 2171-1 and 2171-2 and the following requirements: • New or replacement streetlight poles shall be located within the public right-of-way or within an easement dedicated to the city, and shall be placed no closer than two feet six inches (2' 6") from the back of curb and one foot from the back of sidewalk. • New luminaries shall be GE-ERL1008C530A Gray, 59 watt, 7,600 lumens with an Intermatic EK4536 photocell.	Noted. Proposed locations and details to be coordinated if utility undergrounding occurs.
<u>PUBLIC SAFETY:</u>	
Comments	Responses
24. Please revise the site plan to indicate designated fire lanes, minimum 24 feet in width.	Dimensioned on the site plan.
Considerations	
<u>PLANNING:</u>	
Comments	Responses
28. There has been heightened expectations with recent cases, particularly by City Council, that projects in the southern area should be held to the same standard of quality design as projects in the northern part of the city. Please consider revising the building elevations to include some design elements that add visual interest and represent the quality expected in all parts of the city, either via materials or other measures, to increase visual interest.	Acknowledged.
Technical Issues	
<u>PLANNING:</u>	
Comments	Responses
29. Please revise site plan to demonstrate compliance with Section 9.105.I of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires the same percentage of ADA spaces to be covered as non-accessible spaces (4% of provided spaces).	Site plan corrected to show. ADA calculations provided.

30. Please revise site plan to indicate a typical length for parallel parking spaces. Must be minimum 21 feet per Section 9.106A.1 of the Zoning Ordinance.	Dimensioned on the site plan.
31. Please revise site plan to indicate all existing easements (along the south property line) and confirm the easements will be preserved.	Provided in the preliminary civil plan set.
32. Please revise site plan to indicate the required setback from back of curb on Miller Road. Minimum 20 feet required per Table 5.3006.C of the Zoning Ordinance.	Dimensioned on the site plan.
<u>TRANSPORTATION PLANNING:</u>	
Comments	Responses
33. Please revise the site plan to indicate dimensions for each vehicle ingress/egress point into the site, and widths for vehicle drive aisles (minimum 24 feet required).	Dimensioned on the site plan.
34. Please provide bike racks that are available to guests and visitors that are not within a secure enclosure for residents only.	Bike racks identified on the site plan.
<u>TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING:</u>	
Comments	Responses
35. The scale on the site plan appears to be incorrect. Please revise.	Scale corrected on the site plan.
36. Please revise the site plan to indicate Sight Distance Easements at the site driveways on 75th Street and Miller Road, not 25' X 25' safety triangles. Refer to Section 5-3.123.D of the DSPM.	Identified on the site plan.
37. Please revise the circulation plan to indicate ADA pedestrian ramps.	Noted on the circulation plan.
38. The north site driveway on Miller Road does not appear to meet type CH-1 design requirements. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan accordingly.	Updated.
<u>CIVIL ENGINEERING</u>	
Comments	Responses
39. Overhangs into the rights-of-way require a Private Improvements in the Right-of-Way (PIR) agreement with the city to be executed. Please provide a plan graphically demonstrating any such encroachment for review and approval by the Transportation Department.	Provided in the preliminary civil plan set.

40. Similar to above, overhangs into public easements require a determination of no-conflict from each beneficiary to the easement. Please provide a plan graphically demonstrating any such encroachments, including the type of easement encroached into, existing or proposed, for review and further direction.	Provided in the preliminary civil set and resubmitted plans.
41. Please revise the site plan to indicate Public Non-Motorized Access Easements (PNMAE) over any portion of the street sidewalk that extends onto the subject site. Refer to Section 2-1.310 of the DSPM.	Provided on the preliminary civil plan set.
42. Any on-site public water lines require a minimum 20-foot wide Water & Sewer Facilities Easement which cannot be encroached upon by any other utility easement, including drainage, or infrastructure. Please revise applicable plans accordingly. Refer to Chapter 7 of the DSPM.	Identified on utility plan.
43. NOTE: this case cannot proceed to a DRB hearing until water & sewer BOD's have been accepted by Water Resources.	Acknowledged. Water and sewer BODs submitted for final review.
44. Please revise the utility plan to include the following ACP notes for proposed connection to ACP pipe:	Provided on utility plan.
<u>LAND DIVISION/SUBDIVISION:</u>	
Comments	Responses
45. Please indicate in the response letter if the intent is to split the residential from the rest of the site via lot split. If this is the intent, submittal documents will need to include an analysis of each future lot demonstrating that each one can "stand alone" with regard to applicable development standards and parking.	Lot split is not being proposed or considered at this time.
<u>PUBLIC SAFETY:</u>	
Comments	Responses
46. Please revise the site plan to indicate either Cross-Access Easements or Emergency Vehicle Access Easement where applicable.	Noted on site plan.
47. Please revise the site plan to indicate the following: • Fire Department Connection (FDC) locations (I's & A's 8.17.2.4.6.1) • Interior fire riser room • Backflow preventers	FDCs, fire riser room, and backflow preventers indicated on plan.

WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES (WCF):**Comments****Responses**

48. There is an existing Verizon cell site on a parking lot light pole (east parking lot) that will be impacted by this proposal. Verizon likely has a long-term lease with the church. With the next submittal, please identify where the cell site is to be relocated on the property. Verizon will need to submit a separate preapplication request to begin the relocation process. Also include in the response letter any update/discussions with Verizon that have occurred, if any.

Identified proposed WCF location on the site plan. Ongoing coordinating with Verizon to submit in a separate application.



October 2nd, 2025

City of Scottsdale Planning & Development
7447 East Indian School Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

**RE: Responses to 1st Review Comments on Design Review for SCOTTSDALE UMC
MULTIFAMILY – 14-DR-2025**

RICK has compiled the following responses to the various comments received from City of Scottsdale staff reviewers for the above-mentioned project. General responses are listed by heading below:

Comments dated 07/18/2025 from Vivian Mu - Preliminary Grading and Drainage Plan

- Comment 1 – Cover sheet included for overall preliminary civil improvement plan.
- Comment 2 – Complied. FEMA table added to cover sheet, as requested.
- Comment 3 – Complied. DR Case Number added to margin of titleblock.
- Comment 4 – Complied. Cross sections included in plan, as requested.
- Comment 5 – Existing connection removed in-lieu of providing retention for the disturbed sections of the Project site.

Comments dated 07/17/2025 from ehayes - Preliminary Utility Plan

- Comment 1 – No work proposed along 75th Street. 75th Street is developed frontage, no additional infrastructure required to cover surrounding uses in existing or proposed condition.
- Comment 2 – Complied. Water service extended to existing building that has been proposed to be removed. Line is no longer showing as it will be demo'd along with the building.
- Comment 3 – Complied. Water meters moved out of sidewalk and backflow preventers relocated to ensure they remain outside of sidewalk path.
- Comment 4 – Complied. Updated backflow note to include "RPPB" acronym and callout proper City of Scottsdale Detail.
- Comment 5 – Complied. Fire service detail updated to note a cut-in tee in lieu of the size on size tapping sleeve and valve.

Comments dated 07/18/2025 from Vivian Mu – Drainage Report

- Comment 1 – Complied. Updated cover sheet with DR #.
- Comment 2 – Complied. Project retention is being provided to avoid relying on the shallow stormdrain system in Miller Road for Project discharge of the developed condition runoff.
- Comment 3 – Complied. Discussion has been provided about the Flo2D model and a hydro exhibit map showing the Flo2D model overlayed on the proposed conditions map has also been provided.

Comments dated 07/24/2025 from Levi Dillon – Sewer Report

- Comment 1 – Complied. Changed keynote language in utility plan.
- Comment 2 – Complied. Noted that no pool or spa amenities are included in this development.
- Comment 3 – Complied. Breakdown provided, as requested. New development flow exceeds existing buildings. Hydraulic analysis provided for new buildings as they represent the greater flow through a single point of discharge.
- Comment 4 – Analysis was already provided for the total development in a single 6” sewer main, denoting that all other service connections would fall below said analysis and demonstrating compliance. Refer to sewer flow spreadsheet in report.
- Comment 5 – Existing buildings described in report.
- Comment 6 – removed the amenity item in the school area, it was no longer needed to be shown.

Comments dated 07/24/2025 from Levi Dillon – Water Report

- Comment 1 – Complied. Line connection now shown as cut-in tee with valves on all 3 sides of the new connection location.
- Comment 2 – Acknowledged. For the new fire service connection, we are now identifying that connection as a cut-in tee. Please confirm scope of required main replacement as a stipulation of DR approval so we can ensure this is captured in our construction documents phase to follow DR approval.
- Comment 3 – Acknowledged and notes corrected to properly reflect 1-1/2” meter that is intended to remain.
- Comment 4 – This was unintentional and the notes have been corrected. The existing meters are intended to be re-used.
- Comment 5 – Complied. Note added to identify fire riser room location.
- Comment 6 – It is understood the standard locations for meters and backflow preventers absent site constraints however, in this case the site planning for the Project desires minimal street setbacks and we have existing utilities under the sidewalk that are part of the developed Miller Road frontage. We have located the water meters within the right-of-way but outside the sidewalk. After manipulating the water meters to the only location they can reside, the backflow preventers have to be moved west, out from the sidewalk, and the to nearest adjacent landscape area. There is a new PUE along the Project frontage so the PUE has also been avoided.
- Comment 7 – Complied. COS # added to title block.
- Comment 8 – Complied. Water service added to be dedicated as a landscape services.
- Comment 9 – There is a fire hydrant immediately to the southeast of the Project, another on the east side of Miller near the northeast corner of the Project site.
- Comment 10 – Complied. Dropped the “private” designation from the water and fire keynotes.
- Comment 11 – Acknowledged. Fire service will be connected to the fire riser room and matching diameter backflow preventers will be installed within the fire riser room per City of Scottsdale Detail.
- Comment 12 – Complied. Updated verbiage in the Existing Conditions Section, as requested.
- Comment 13 – A fire hydrant flow test will be provided with a subsequent design submittal.

Comment 14 – Complied. Updated verbiage in the PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM Section to correct the water meter configurations and note the backflow for fire will be within the fire riser room.

Comment 15 – Complied. Broke out the building calculations for the new buildings, as requested.

Comment 16 – Complied. Updated note verbiage to highlight GPM is for both the existing and proposed conditions.

Comment 17 – Complied. Valves added on both legs of the shared fire service where each is conveyed to the fire riser room.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

RICK

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JPH' followed by a stylized flourish.

Jeff Hunt, P.E.
Principal
(623) 341-7892
jhunt@rickengineering.com