



Correspondence Between Staff and Applicant

Approval Letter

March 4, 2020

2051 W Northern Ave #100
Phoenix AZ 85021
P: 602.335.8500
F: 602.335.8580
www.woodpatel.com

Mr. Alex Meñez, PE, CFM
Sr. Stormwater Engineer
City of Scottsdale
Stormwater Management
7447 East Indian School Road, Suite 125
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Darrel E. Wood, PE, RLS
Ashok C. Patel, PE, RLS, CFM
Michael T. Young, PE, LEED AP
James S. Campbell, PE, LEED GA
Thomas R. Gettings, RLS
Darin L. Moore, PE, LEED GA
Jeffrey R. Minch, PE, CFM
Robert D. Gofonia, PE, RLS
Nicholas E. Brown, PE

Re: **Raintree Phase III Residential Building**
1st Review Comment Response Letter
Preliminary Drainage Report
7-GP-2019 & 19-ZN-2019
WP# 195063

Dear Mr. Meñez:

Below are WOODPATEL's responses to the City of Scottsdale's February 3, 2020 1st review of the Raintree Phase III Residential Building Preliminary Drainage Report:

Drainage

Comment #19 Please submit a revised Drainage Report with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A. The revised Drainage Report shall address the following:

Comment #19A The drainage report provided does not meet the minimum requirements in the DSPM. There are numerous gaps and inconsistencies in the drainage report that need to be resolved in order to facilitate a proper review. Review the requirements in the DSPM and update accordingly. For a sample, look at the previous submittal for 9-PP-2019. For example:

Response #19 **This Preliminary Drainage Report has been reformatted to include the items requested and meet the requirements of the DS&PM.**

- Comment #19A(i)1. The Drainage Report must provide an Existing Conditions Drainage Exhibit, which has the following:
- Label all existing stormwater basins and infrastructure. The report mentions four basins, but not all are labeled.
- Response #19A(i)1. An Existing Drainage Exhibit has been incorporated into the report as Exhibit 4, identifying the existing stormwater basins and infrastructure.**
- Comment #19A(i)2. Show the direction of onsite drainage.
- Response #19A(i)2. The direction of onsite drainage is identified on the new Existing Drainage Exhibit.**
- Comment #19A(i)3. Label Q₁₀₀ leaving the site.
- Response #19A(i)3 Based on our understanding of the previously approved master drainage reports, the existing onsite drainage system manages the Q₁₀₀ flow.**
- Comment #19A(ii) Explain the purpose of the Proposed Boundary Map (Exhibit 3). Is there missing information on this exhibit?
- Response #19A(ii) This Preliminary Drainage Report has been reformatted to include the items requested and meet the requirements of the DS&PM. Please refer to the new Exhibits 3, 4 and 5.**
- Comment #19A(iii) The Proposed Drainage Map (Exhibit 4) has confusing linework and labels and is missing information.
- Response #19A(iii) This Preliminary Drainage Report has been reformatted to include the items requested and meet the requirements of the DS&PM. Please refer to the new Exhibits 3, 4 and 5.**
- Comment #19A(iii)1. Clarify the labels for the retention basins. These should be different than drainage subbasin labels.
- Response #19A(iii)1 Drainage area sub basin IDs and retention basin labels have been updated to match those referenced in the previously approved Master Drainage Reports. Please refer to the new Exhibits 3, 4 and 5.**
- Comment #19A(iii)2. Provide labels for the stormwater basins including, HW, bottom, volume required and volume provided.
- Response #19A(iii)2 Retention basin labels have been updated to include the high water elevation (HWE), bottom elevation (BOT), and volume provided (V_p). Please refer to report Appendix A for Phase I + III volume required calculations.**
- Comment #19A(iii)3 Label Q₁₀₀ leaving the site.
- Response #19A(iii)3 The onsite drainage system will manage the Q₁₀₀ flow based on our understanding of the existing master drainage system and the proposed onsite drainage improvements shown.**
- Comment #19A(iii)4. Adjust line weights and thicknesses to ensure drainage map can be readily understood.
- Response #19A(iii)4 This Preliminary Drainage Report has been reformatted. Please refer to the new Exhibits 3, 4 and 5 with the above described additional information for clarity.**

Comment B Because of the lack of information provided in this submittal, additional comments should be expected with the next review.

Response B **Comment noted; please contact our office if we can assist during second review of this report.**

Please contact me directly if you have any additional questions or comments regarding the revised Preliminary Drainage Report and/or the above responses.

Sincerely,

Wood, Patel & Associates, Inc.



Darin L. Moore, PE

DLM/se

EXPIRES 06-30-22

Y:\WP\General Correspondence\195063 Raintree III 1st Review Prelim Drainage Report Comment Response Ltr 03-04-20.docx

Resubmittal to City: March 6, 2020

Item	Response	Responsible Party
Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues		
General Plan & Greater Airpark Character Area Plan (GACAP)		
1. Please respond to Goal 4, Bullets 3 and 4, of the Land Use Element which seeks to maintain a balance of land uses that support a high quality of life, a diverse mixture of housing, leisure opportunities, and the economic base needed to secure resources to support the community. The response should identify how the proposal will equally or better implement the objectives of the General Plan.	Project Narrative updated to include goal and bullets.	BR
2. Please respond to Goal 8, Bullets 1, 2, and 3 and Goal 9, Bullets 1, 2, and 4 of the Land Use Element which encourages land uses that create a sense of community among those who work, live, and play within local neighborhoods. Similar to the response to the PCP District findings, please remark how the site will build upon the connections between existing land uses of retail, employment, and recreational and other public land uses (Thunderbird Park) within the context area.	Project Narrative updated to include goals, bullets and policies.	BR
3. Please respond Goal 2, Bullets 3 and 5, and Goal 3, Bullet of the Housing Element and Goal 10, along with any applicable bullets, of the Preservation and Environmental Planning Element, and finally, Goal EP1, Policy EP1.4 and EP1.9 of the Environmental Preservation Chapter of the GACAP addressing how the proposed development may, if at all, utilize green building alternatives that support sustainable desert living as a means to increase housing supply while promoting diversity and neighborhood vitality.	Project Narrative updated to include goals, bullets and policies.	BR – narrative ESG/TCC
A. Please note, Scottsdale is progressively attempting to install in capital projects, and request from private development applications, Low Impact Development (LID) and Green Infrastructure (GI) as a method of stormwater control, water harvesting, and cleansing for the first flush requirements of the City’s Floodplain Ordinance. Recognizing the sites proximal location to the Greenbelt, a major stormwater corridor, please consider utilization of this resource. More information on this initiative can be found at: https://sustainability.asu.edu/sustainable-cities/resources/lid-handbook/	Acknowledged.	BR Team to acknowledge

Item	Response	Responsible Party
<p>4. Please respond to Goal 8, Bullets 1 and 3 of the Community Mobility Element which emphasizes live, work, and play land use relationships to optimize the use of citywide systems and reduce the strain on regional and local/neighborhoods systems. The response should identify how a designation within a Mixed-Use Neighborhood land use designation, now with a portion proposed as Airpark Mixed Use – Residential by the GACAP, will equally or better implement the objectives of the General Plan.</p>	<p>Project Narrative updated to include goal and bullets.</p>	<p>BR</p>
<p>5. As a response to Goal 1 of the Community Involvement 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.</p>	<p>Updated Citizen Involvement Report included with the resubmittal.</p>	<p>BR/TS</p>
<p>6. Please respond to Goal LU4, Policy LU4.6 and LU4.7 of the Land Use Chapter of the GACAP, which expects that development proposal utilize development types to guide the physical and building form of the Greater Airpark. To this end, expand on the statement, “The residential building has been designed in a manner that provides a sensitivity to the pedestrian providing numerous connection points through the site, which do not exist today.” What specifically is this development providing?</p>	<p>Project Narrative updated to include goal and policies.</p> <p><i>Note; pedestrian diagram updated to more clearly reflect additional site pedestrian connections. Ref A.s.2</i></p> <p>Additional connections are made from amenity nodes to full-site N/S and E/W pedestrian circulation paths. Pedestrian links are also made from ground floor residential units to internal circulation paths, helping to activate street frontages within and around the site.</p>	<p>BR - narrative</p> <p>ESG to update pedestrian circulation plan</p>
<p>7. Please respond to Goal 8, Policies LU 8.1, 8.2, and 8.3 of the Land Use Chapter and Goal NH2, Policies NH 2.3 and 2.4 of the Neighborhoods and Housing Chapter of the GACAP with respect to how the proposed site development area (+/- 9.64 acres) recognizes and values the provision of usable open space – specifically for the residential component – as part of the community’s overall quality of life</p>	<p>Project Narrative updated to include goals and policies.</p>	<p>BR</p>
<p>A. Please provide an open space plan that graphically depicts the locations of the referenced open space on Page 16, which remarks an “abundance” of open space over the required 28% required by the Zoning Ordinance; 29.8% provided (+1.8% excess).</p>	<p><i>Note; ref landscape sheets LA2.01 and LA2.02</i></p>	<p>ESG</p>

Item	Response	Responsible Party
<p>B. Please narratively describe how access to the Vanguard Plaza (shown as pool access), located south and west of the subject site will be provided in perpetuity and what furthermore, how the site will be programmed (if at all).</p>	<p>The existing Vanguard Plaza is not included in the site development scope and is owned by a separate entity. No pool or resident access will be provided to the Vanguard Plaza</p>	<p>BR ESG to update plan</p>
<p>C. Please provide a pedestrian plan that identifies area-wide pedestrian destinations, connections and pathway. both existing and proposed.</p>	<p><i>Note; pedestrian diagram updated to more clearly reflect existing and proposed site pedestrian connections. Ref A.s.2</i></p>	<p>ESG</p>
<p>i. Please identify if controlled access, by manned gate access, is to remain with access from Northsight and Raintree Boulevards.</p>	<p><i>Note; Residential site plan and vehicular diagram updated to note removal of gates at Northsight and Raintree entry points. Ref A.s.1, A.f.2</i></p> <p>The existing manned gates on Raintree and Northsight are to be removed for improved site access. The gate on Northsight is property of the adjacent Vanguard Office Plaza and will be removed as part of their scope of work.</p>	<p>BR ESG</p>
<p>D. Please consider the provision of an enhanced east-west pedestrian connection from 87th Street to the “Proposed Outdoor Amenity Space” between parking structures (see below) as envisioned by 63-DR-2000#2.</p>	<p><i>Note; reference pedestrian diagram for E/W connection through office development to 87th. Ref A.s.2, A.f.3.</i></p> <p>We understand the desire to provide additional connection points to 87th but would like to encourage pedestrians to use a safer path of travel. The path proposed by City staff would occur between two parking garages and has many characteristics that go against Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CEPTD) standards. This particular area has many potential hiding and blind spots, is hidden from view, is potentially dangerous at night where it is not visual or within hearing range of more publicly occupied areas. We propose instead to focus pedestrians along the E/W sidewalk direction south of the office building, as well as the reconfigured sidewalks along Raintree.</p>	<p>BR ESG - plan</p>
<p>E. Please clarify in both narrative and graphic response, the purpose of the area highlighted below. The first submittal had contradicting information for this this location – in some areas referenced as trash pickup while in other documents it designates this location as an</p>	<p><i>Note; reference pedestrian diagram, residential plan and landscape plans for clarity. Ref A.s.2, A.f.2, LA-101</i></p> <p>This area provides a landscaped entry and exit point for ground</p>	<p>ESG</p>

Item	Response	Responsible Party
open space area for residents to congregate {building entry graphic}	floor residents along the southern portion of the building.	
<p>8. Please respond to Goal LU5, Policy LU5.2 of the Land Use Chapter of the GACAP which remarks that “Greater Airpark public amenities and benefits should be provided by the private sector when development bonuses, such as increased floor area, greater intensity, greater height development standards flexibility, and/or street abandonment are considered.”</p> <p>The first submittal requests the Zoning Ordinance bonus provision for additional floor area (Zoning Ordinance, Section 5.4008, Page 27 of the first submittal). This proposal requests an additional 109,673 sq. ft. at a contribution of \$1,484,407 in special improvements. However, the improvements have not been identified within the provided narrative. Accordingly, upon resubmittal, please identify the special improvements this application is providing</p>	Amount has been updated in the Project Narrative for the 2021 calendar year = \$1,536,361	TCC /BR
<p>9. Please respond to Goal CM6, Policy CM6.1 and CM6.2 of the Community Mobility Chapter of the GACAP which encourages enhancing pedestrian and bicyclist access and activity for Greater Airpark residents, visitors, and employees. The response should identify how a designation within a Mixed-Use Neighborhood land use designation, now with a portion proposed as Airpark Mixed Use – Residential by the GACAP, will equally or better implement the objectives of the General Plan by supporting – through appropriate site design - an attractive, safe, and engaging pedestrian environment for all users.</p>	Project Narrative updated to include goals and policies.	BR
<p>10. Please respond to Goal CM7, Policy CM7.1 of the Community Mobility Chapter, of the GACAP which promotes sustainable options that meet the needs of the current and future Greater Airpark Community. In particular, the first review submittal locates minimal guest parking adjacent to the proposed retention basin south of the internal drive aisle. Upon resubmittal, please clarify both graphically and narratively, the location of all guest parking that will be available , and finally where parking is not located behind a gated location how parking will be managed for the sole use of the proposed development versus the adjacent existing or proposed office uses.</p>	<p>Project Narrative updated to include goals and policies.</p> <p><i>Note; Residential site plan and vehicular diagram updated to note surface parking near Multi-Use Amenity Space as Residential Guest Parking only. Ref A.s.1, A.f.2</i></p> <p>A 9-stall surface parking lot near the south multiuse park amenity space is provided solely for Residential Guest Parking, and will be clearly signed to denote this use. The neighboring proposed and existing office buildings include dedicated parking garages with an excess of guest spaces directly adjacent to their respective buildings, further reducing the likelihood that users of those facilities will incidentally park in the Residential Guest</p>	<p>BR – narrative</p> <p>ESG - plan</p>

Item	Response	Responsible Party
	Parking spaces.	
11. Please respond to all applicable Goals and Policies of the Character and Design Chapter of the GACAP.	Project Narrative updated to include CD goals and policies.	BR
12. To not confuse the public, please correct the misprint on Page 13 of the first review narrative relating to Development Types; 'C1' should be 'A'.	Typo corrected.	BR
13. To not confuse the public, please correctly locate the subject site on Page 21/figure of "Greater Airpark Transit Connections", of the first review narrative.	Corrected.	BR
Zoning		
14. With the next submittal, please submit a Development Agreement (DA) application as a companion to the proposed Planned Shared District (PSD) zoning application. (Zoning Ordinance, Sec. 1.303.).	Draft Development Agreement completed and will be submitted under separate application.	BR
15. Please provide an update to the Citizen Review Report with any additional input that has been received regarding the proposed applications. (Zoning Ordinance, Sec. 1.305.C.).	Updated Citizen Involvement Report included with the resubmittal.	BR/TS
Circulation		
16. Please submit a revised Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis (TIMA) that addresses the following:		
A. A Category I Traffic Statement was submitted. The City Transportation Department had requested that a Category II Traffic Impact Mitigation Analysis (TIMA) be prepared and submitted (DSPM 5-1.102) since no previous study could be found with the current zoning. Should a TIMA exist for the underlying zoning, it would likely be decades old and require updating since development patterns have changed dramatically in the area over time. A TIMA analyses would provide the opportunity to evaluate current intersection operations adjacent to and in the vicinity of the project site as well as future impacts to the transportation system as a result of the project. (DSPM 5-1.100, 5- 1.102).	A Category II TIMA will be submitted.	LO
B. City staff has expressed concern with the use of comparing maximum build-out of approved existing zoning as a point of comparison. Further, the way the Traffic Statement was prepared, one may deduce that the net new traffic added to the existing	Will clarify text and labeling in report.	LO

Item	Response	Responsible Party
<p>system decreases. The site is currently vacant and a portrayal of a reduction in net new traffic to the existing system is misleading to decision makers and the general public. (DSPM 5-1.100, 5-1.102).</p>		
<p>C. During the pre-application meeting, City staff requested an evaluation that included a left-out restriction at the main Raintree Drive access (currently full-access). The request to evaluate this type of operation is due to the high crash rate on Raintree Drive, as documented in the Traffic Statement. Please provide an evaluation of this in the TIMA.</p>	<p>Will include in Category II TIMA along with crash analysis.</p>	<p>LO</p>
<p>D. While crash rates were identified in the Traffic Statement, there was no discussion about potential mitigations. Please provide further analysis of potential mitigations in the TIMA.</p>	<p>Will provide with Category II TIMA.</p>	<p>LO</p>
<p>E. The Traffic Statement does not discuss the operations of the accesses along Raintree Dr and Northsight Blvd. Currently, these are gate-controlled accesses. It is unable to be determined in the Traffic Statement if the same level of control will remain in effect with the project. Please provide information regarding this in the TIMA.</p>	<p>Will provide with Category II TIMA.</p>	<p>LO</p>
<p>F. City staff has potential concerns with the Traffic Statement's conclusion that increasing traffic on Raintree Drive 8.9% will result in minimal traffic impacts to the existing roadway network and the surrounding area. Please provide analysis within the TIMA to confirm this conclusion.</p>	<p>Will provide detailed peak hour analysis with Category II TIMA.</p>	<p>LO</p>
<p>G. City staff requested that a traffic analysis include a pedestrian evaluation, but none was provided. Please provide this analysis within the TIMA.</p>	<p>Will provide pedestrian discussion in Category II TIMA. Also see updated pedestrian plan prepared by ESG architects.</p>	<p>LO ESG - plan</p>
<p>17. Please revise the project plans to reflect the dedication of 55 feet of fee-title right-of-way along the entire Raintree Drive site frontage (both multi-family and office parcels) for the Minor Arterial, Suburban Character, street cross section. (Fig. 5-3.5 of the DSPM; DSPM Sec. 5-3.100; Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-10).</p>	<p><i>Note; ROW updated. Ref A.d.1, A.f.2, A.f.3</i> ROW updated to reflect 55' ROW along Raintree Drive for both multi-family and office parcels.</p>	<p>ESG</p>

Item	Response	Responsible Party
Significant Policy Related Issues		
Site Design		
18. The Planned Airpark Core Development (PCP) zoning district expects that development should:		
A. Accommodate mixed-use commerce and employment centers.		
B. Provide a dynamic complement to employment cores with support retail, service, tourism, cultural, and residential uses.		
C. Promote an efficient and safe traffic circulation system through the inclusion of a mix of complementary uses and provisions for multiple modes of travel.		
D. Promote architectural excellence and creative design through development standards that create high quality character for structures, site plans, and streetscapes.		
E. Protect adjacent neighborhoods through strict development standards while encouraging innovative site planning and environmental sensitivity throughout the PCP District.		
F. Provide an open space framework of enhanced streetscapes, functional pedestrian spaces, enhanced view corridors and other public environmental amenities.		
G. Promote environmental stewardship and sustainability through the application of recognized and established environmentally responsible building techniques and desert appropriate design approaches.		
Items D, F, and G (above) are of significance to this proposal, in that this will be the first of any PCP development that will be directly contiguous to, and surrounded by, non-residential development. When considering D, F, and G, the first submittal for this application proposes a 5 story, +/-62' tall multifamily residential building that:		
i. Provides limited public open space and the provisions of functional pedestrian spaces beyond the internal amenity locations.	Project Narrative, site plan and landscape plan updated.	BR – narrative ESG - plan
ii. Provides limited landscaping at the ground level	Landscape Plan updated	BR – narrative ESG - plan

Item	Response	Responsible Party
<p>Prioritizing open space and a reduction in the apparent mass of the sites building, please consider the following approaches in responding to D, F, and G:</p>		
<p>i. Building Design and Conceptual Site Plan</p>		
<p>1. Vary building placement and/or setback from property lines or other point of reference</p>	<p><i>Note; Plans, elevations, renderings and diagrams provide additional information RE: Building Design.</i></p> <p>The design proposal approaches setbacks at two scales. First, making large moves to break down the overall mass into small volumes -- the north, east and south frontages all incorporate a minimum 10' step-back in the massing to help reduce the visual impact of the building. Second, balconies are inset and stitched together, vertically, to visually pronounce these additional undulations. In order to incorporate even more variation on the façade, material accents are used to diversify these balcony insets.</p> <p>In their entirety, massing setbacks vary around the perimeter of the building, providing areas that are set back as little as 8'-0" to larger setbacks at 75'-0". Creating a variety of setbacks allows for a perceived variability in the façade and helps to provide a dynamic pedestrian experience; as it relates to the distinct character of each street frontage.</p>	<p>ESG</p>
<p>2. Reconfigure apartments into U –shaped building(s) or a building having a linear core with perpendicular “wings” or “fingers”.</p>	<p><i>Note; Plans, elevations, renderings and diagrams provide additional information RE: Building Design.</i></p> <p>The overall building fully encompasses a concealed, structured parking deck in the center of the site. The placement of the parking structure provides active frontages on all edges of the site while creating visual interest (not present when above-grade parking is left exposed). The result of these active frontages is a building mass that engages street edges, creates depth at approximately 25' intervals with recessed balconies, and differentiation at critical building planes with 50-75' intervals of large building recesses.</p>	<p>ESG</p>

Item	Response	Responsible Party
3. Articulate building mass with step backs, varied building placement/setback and variation in building height.	<p><i>Note; Plans, elevations, renderings and diagrams provide additional information RE: building design.</i></p> <p>Reference response to 18.i.1 for building step-back and setback description.</p>	ESG
4. Utilize material changes, fenestration and other architectural element to subdivide building walls and smaller components.	<p><i>Note; Plans, elevations, renderings and diagrams provide additional information RE: building design.</i></p> <p>Building masses and frontages are subdivided through several strategies, while keeping in line with the rhythm and material palette of adjacent developments. These strategies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vertical balcony recesses accented with material changes and roof varies that provide visual relief along lengthy frontages. This roofline articulation creates a noticeable feature on the corner of Raintree Drive and N 87th Street. In addition to providing a dynamic roofline, the elongated top floor balconies provide visual relief to the top of the building; a contextual cue taken from the architecture of adjacent office developments. • Typical inset balcony details are placed at frequent intervals of 19-25', with material accent at the rear walls to further call attention to this relief in the facade. • Windows detailed to inset half the depth of the wall and are further accented on the south and west facades through projected shading devices. <p>The rhythm of these material changes and inset balconies allow for a simpler palette of materials to be expressed on the entire project while still providing enough variation to situate itself in the typology of Scottsdale.</p>	ESG
ii. Pedestrian Connections and Open Space		
1. Provide direct pedestrian access to exterior ground floor units.	<p><i>Note; Residential Site Plan and Pedestrian diagram provide clarity on access to ground floor units. Ref A.f.2, A.s.2</i></p> <p>Each ground floor unit incorporates direct exterior access to a private outdoor patio, and in almost all cases direct access to the</p>	ESG

Item	Response	Responsible Party
	enhanced pedestrian circulation network on and around the site. These ground floor entries are delineated by raised concrete patios, low site walls, gates and landscape screening.	
<p>2. Identify a north/south pedestrian route to the primary open space of the pool near the mid-point of the site rather than at the west end of the site which is crowded by the Vanguard driveway.</p>	<p><i>Note; Residential Site Plan and Pedestrian diagram provide clarity on access to ground floor units. Ref A.f.2, A.s.2, LA1.01</i></p> <p>A building entrance has been added toward the center of the building (North side) in order to ameliorate pedestrian conflict with the Vanguard driveway. A 6' sidewalk path has been added, connecting the building with the sidewalk along Raintree. The crosswalk at the South end of the building that connects to the linear amenity space has been shifted East to reinforce the pedestrian connectivity along the site.</p>	ESG
<p>3. Reconfigure existing or incorporate additional open space at the project entrance and near building entrances.</p>	<p><i>Note; Landscape Open Space Plan clarifies extent of open space at entries. Ref LA2.01</i></p> <p>The primary residential project entrance has been reconfigured to provide additional pedestrian safety features and optimize open space at these entries. Landscaped pedestrian zones frame the primary entry to the north and south, providing a landscape softened pedestrian entry sequence.</p> <p>Private, exterior patios with planted perimeters serve as a soft threshold into each unit.</p>	ESG
<p>iii. Integration with Surrounding Development</p>		
<p>1. Prepare and submit a concept development plan that includes a contextual site plan showing area-wide pedestrian destinations, connections and pathways. Anticipate pedestrian connection to adjoining properties and provide option for future connections.</p>	<p><i>Note; Ref A.s.2</i></p>	ESG
<p>2. Incorporate pedestrian scale lighting and access to amenity areas.</p>	<p><i>Note; Residential Site Plan and Landscape Plan. Ref A.f.2, LA1.01</i></p> <p>Pedestrian scale lighting callouts at all key pedestrian circulation areas have been added and called out on the Landscape Plans. This includes The Raintree entry sidewalk, pedestrian gates, and circulation nodes along the West pedestrian path.</p>	ESG

Item	Response	Responsible Party
<p>3. Incorporate entrances to ground floor units where buildings front streets. Design defensible space for security and privacy. Utilize low walls, and view fencing, plant barriers and grade changes for creating separation.</p>	<p><i>Note; Residential Site Plan and Pedestrian diagram provide clarity on access to ground floor units. Ref A.f.2, A.s.2, A.hh.1, LA1.01</i></p> <p>Each ground floor unit incorporates direct exterior access to a private, outdoor patio and in almost all cases direct access to the enhanced pedestrian circulation network on and around the site. The defensible measures between the public realm and private patios is accomplished using low wall enclosures, raised concrete patios, substantial plantings and pedestrian scale lighting. An additional level of security is provided at the Southern and Western-facing units which are accessed through gated entries. Patios within these zones provide soft landscaping and grade changes to help define private areas.</p>	<p>ESG</p>
Drainage		
<p>19. Please submit a revised Drainage Report with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A. The revised Drainage Report shall address the following:</p>		
<p>A. The drainage report provided does not meet the minimum requirements in the DSPM. There are numerous gaps and inconsistencies in the drainage report that need to be resolved in order to facilitate a proper review. Review the requirements in the DSPM and update accordingly. For a sample, look at the previous submittal for 9-PP-2019. For example:</p>	<p>This Preliminary Drainage Report has been reformatted to include the items requested and meet the requirements of the DS&PM.</p>	<p>WP</p>
<p>i. The Drainage Report must provide an Existing Conditions Drainage Exhibit, which has the following:</p>		
<p>1. Label all existing stormwater basins and infrastructure. The report mentions four basins, but not all are labeled</p>	<p>An Existing Drainage Exhibit has been incorporated into the report as Exhibit 4, identifying the existing stormwater basins and infrastructure.</p>	<p>WP</p>
<p>2. Show the direction of onsite drainage.</p>	<p>The direction of onsite drainage is identified on the new Existing Drainage Exhibit.</p>	<p>WP</p>
<p>3. Label Q₁₀₀ leaving the site.</p>	<p>Based on our understanding of the previously approved master drainage reports, the existing onsite drainage system manages the Q₁₀₀ flow.</p>	<p>WP</p>

Item	Response	Responsible Party
ii. Explain the purpose of the Proposed Boundary Map (Exhibit 3). Is there missing information on this exhibit?	This Preliminary Drainage Report has been reformatted to include the items requested and meet the requirements of the DS&PM. Please refer to the new Exhibits 3, 4 and 5.	WP
iii. The Proposed Drainage Map (Exhibit 4) has confusing linework and labels and is missing information	This Preliminary Drainage Report has been reformatted to include the items requested and meet the requirements of the DS&PM. Please refer to the new Exhibits 3, 4 and 5.	WP
1. Clarify the labels for the retention basins. These should be different than drainage subbasin labels.	Drainage area sub basin IDs and retention basin labels have been updated to match those referenced in the previously approved Master Drainage Reports. Please refer to the new Exhibits 3, 4 and 5.	WP
2. Provide labels for the stormwater basins including, HW, bottom, volume required and volume provided.	Retention basin labels have been updated to include the high water elevation (HWE), bottom elevation (BOT), and volume provided (Vp). Please refer to report Appendix A for Phase I + III volume required calculations.	WP
3. Label Q ₁₀₀ leaving the site.	The onsite drainage system will manage the Q ₁₀₀ flow based on our understanding of the existing master drainage system and the proposed onsite drainage improvements shown.	WP
4. Adjust line weights and thicknesses to ensure drainage map can be readily understood.	This Preliminary Drainage Report has been reformatted. Please refer to the new Exhibits 3, 4 and 5 with the above described additional information for clarity.	WP
B. Because of the lack of information provided in this submittal, additional comments should be expected with the next review.	Comment noted; please contact our office if we can assist during second review of this report.	WP
Circulation		
20. Please revise the project plans to provide a minimum 6-foot-wide sidewalk connection from the site buildings to Northsight Boulevard through the interior of the site (not along Raintree Drive). The Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation Plan has a gap in the sidewalk southwest of the site buildings.	<i>Note; Ref A.f.2, LA1.01</i> The sidewalk southwest of the building has been extended (gap removed). A hatch and note "connect to existing sidewalk" has been added to Landscape Plans	ESG
21. Please revise the project plans to show the sight distance triangle at the site driveway on Raintree Drive. Due to the right-turn deceleration lane and horizontal curvature in Raintree Drive to the west the existing safety triangles may not be adequate. Dedicate sight distance easements over the private property as necessary. (DSPM Sec. 5-3.123; Figs. 5-3.25 and 5- 3.26)	<i>Note; Ref A.f.1, A.f.2, LA1.01</i> The site distance triangles have been incorporated and noted on the site plan. All vegetation and obstructions above 3.5 feet have been removed from these areas.	ESG

Item	Response	Responsible Party
<p>22. Please revise the project plans to indicate the rededication of the safety triangles at the site driveway and Raintree Drive intersection based upon the 55-foot right-of-way dedication for Raintree Drive. (DSPM 5-3.123; Fig. 5-3.27)</p>	<p><i>Note; Ref A.f.2, A.f.3, Civil Pg2</i></p> <p>The drawings have been updated to accommodate the rededication of safety triangles based upon the 55' ROW along Raintree Dr. All vegetation and obstructions above 2.5 feet have been removed from these areas.</p>	<p>ESG</p>
<p>23. Please revise the project plans to indicate the dedication of a safety triangle at the 87th Street and Raintree Drive intersection based upon the 55-foot right-of-way dedication for Raintree Drive. (DSPM 5-3.123; Fig. 5-3.27)</p>	<p><i>Note; Ref A.f.2, A.f.3, Civil Pg2</i></p> <p>The drawings have been updated to accommodate the rededication of safety triangles based upon the 55' ROW along Raintree Dr. Please note, this does not impact the safety triangle at N 87th St, as the additional ROW width was previously included at this intersection.</p>	<p>ESG</p>
<p>Engineering</p>		
<p>24. Please revise the refuse truck path as shown in the following graphic:</p>		
<p>25. The truck forks are not aligned properly with the trash/recycling room overhead doors. Please provide information on the container servicing circulation path.</p>	<p><i>Note; Ref A.f.4</i></p> <p>The overhead door to the trash room has been shifted west to properly align the container circulation path with the refuse truck forks.</p>	<p>ESG</p>
<p>26. Please revise the truck path radii to comply with DSPM standards as noted in the following graphic: {graphic provided in letter}</p>	<p><i>Note; Ref A.f.4</i></p> <p>Truck circulation path has been revised to comply with required 45' outer turning radius as noted in the DSPM standards.</p>	<p>ESG</p>
<p>Technical Corrections</p>		
<p>Circulation</p>		
<p>27. Please revise the project plans to modify the existing median opening on Raintree Drive at the site driveway/private drive to restrict access to left-in, right-in, and right-out only. Modify the existing striping on the private driveway to identify one right-turn only lane; eliminate the through/left turn lane marking.</p>	<p>It has been determined that full access is acceptable. No changes to the driveway are proposed.</p>	<p>LO ESG</p>

Item	Response	Responsible Party
28. Please provide documentation to verify that the site has access through the adjacent parcel to the west to allow tenants, visitors, emergency, and service vehicles to access the site from Northsight Boulevard.	Recorded Access Easement provided with resubmittal.	TCC
29. Please revise the project plans so that the sidewalk location along the eastern side of the multi-family building is located adjacent to the private drive, not adjacent to the building to provide sight visibility of the pedestrian crossing for vehicles leaving the parking garage. Also, the proposed crosswalk on the private drive should align with the sidewalk to the east, not jog to the north. This area of the site needs to be modified to improve pedestrian safety.	<p><i>Note; Ref A.f.2, LA1.01</i></p> <p>The sidewalk along the eastern side of the building has been revised and is now an attached sidewalk. The crosswalk locations have been revised in order to increase pedestrian safety. The building entry drop-off vehicular entrance has been revised by shifting north, allowing for a clear pedestrian path between the new building entrance to the crosswalks, to the opposite sidewalk corner ramps.</p>	ESG
30. Please revise the project plans to show the construction of a pedestrian refuge in the Northsight Boulevard median between the site driveway on Northsight Boulevard and the Northsight Park entrance.	The pedestrian refuge had been evaluated but is not being pursued by TCC.	LO ESG



July 2, 2020

John Berry
Berry Riddell LLC
6750 E Camelback Rd Ste 100
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Re: 7-GP-2019, 19-ZN-2019 & 2-DA-2020
TCC - Raintree

Dear John Berry,

This is to advise you that the cases referenced above were approved at the June 30, 2020 City Council meeting. The City Council related documents may be obtained from the City Clerk's office located at 3939 N. Drinkwater Blvd. Scottsdale, AZ 85251 or by entering the document number through the city website @ <https://eservices.scottsdaleaz.gov/cityclerk/DocumentSearch>

Please remove the red hearing sign as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please contact me at 480-312-7713 or at bcarr@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,

Brad Carr, AICP, LEED-AP
Principal Planner