



Correspondence Between Staff and Applicant

Approval Letter

Denial Letter



December 8, 2020

Chris Brown
Residential Pursuits Investments, LLC
7600 E Doubletree Ranch Rd Ste 130
Scottsdale, Az

Re: 424-PA-2019
18-ZN-2019
Scottsdale Nazarene Rezoning

Dear Chris Brown,

This is to advise you that the case referenced above was approved at the December 7, 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 480-312-2376 or at jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,

Jeff Barnes
Senior Planner



Planning and Development Services Division

7447 East Indian School Road
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

9/23/2020

Chris Brown
Residential Pursuits Investments, LLC
7600 E Doubletree Ranch Rd Ste 130
Scottsdale, Az

RE: Determination of a Planning Commission hearing

Dear Mr. Brown:

Your Development Application 18-ZN-2019, Scottsdale Nazarene Rezoning, is scheduled on the 11/18/2020 Planning Commission hearing agenda.

You may be required to make a presentation to the Planning Commission. If you choose to present your application to the Planning Commission utilizing a Power Point presentation, please submit the electronic file to your project coordinator by 1:00 p.m. on Monday 11/16/2020. Please limit your presentation to a maximum of 10 minutes.

A subsequent letter with your site post requirements will be sent shortly after the required text has been verified. Typically, this is approximately twenty-one (21) days before a hearing date.

The Planning and Development Services Division has had this application in review for 48 Staff Review Days.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jeff Barnes", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Jeff Barnes
Senior Planner

C: Case File

Reponses to Comments Regarding 18-ZN-2019 dated 7/24/2020

Significant Policy Related Issues

Circulation:

1. The proposed driveway for the church parking lot is a single lane, right turn out only driveway which will be used primarily on Sunday mornings. The right turn only movement is onto Hayden, which has a median at this location.
2. The curb returns are shown to have a 25-foot radius. This intersection of Sheridan Street and Hayden Road services only 26 single family lots. In surveying returns along Hayden Road in the immediate area:
 - At the shopping center at Thomas Road they are 25 feet on north side and 20 feet on south side.
 - At Oak north side is 25 feet
 - Colonia Verde street is 25 feet on both sides.
 - Wilshire is 25 feet on both sides.
 - At the apartments at 2700 N Hayden they are 25 feet on north side and 15 on south side.

Should returns of 30-foot radius be installed, the relocation of the existing gas vault would be required at a minimum.

3. Sidewalk ramps at the intersection of Sheridan Street and Hayden Road are shown to be per COS Std. Detail #2234.

Technical Corrections

Circulation:

4. Sheridan Street is shown to have a single lane exiting onto Hayden Road.

Drainage:

5. A note has been added that states that the finished floor of the church building shall be a minimum of 1-foot above the outfall elevation of the retention basins.

Water and Wastewater:

6. The manhole being connected to in Hayden Road will be subject to City of Scottsdale requirements due to this connection.

Other:

7. A separate exhibit has been prepared to clearly show the proposed zoning boundaries.



7/24/2020

Chris Brown
Residential Pursuits Investments, LLC
7600 E Doubletree Ranch Rd Ste 130
Scottsdale, Az

RE: 18-ZN-2019 (Scottsdale Nazarene Rezoning)

Dear Mr. Brown:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 7/2/2020. The following **2nd Review Comments** represent the review performed by our team, and is intended to provide you with guidance for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application.

Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the second review of this application. While these issues may not be critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, they may affect the City Staff's recommendation pertaining to the application and should be addressed with the resubmittal of the revised application material. Please address the following:

Circulation:

1. The proposed site driveway on Hayden Road for the church parking lot is not allowed per DSPM 5-3.201, which requires minimum 330-feet of separation between driveway and street intersections. Please revise the plans accordingly.
2. Please revise the plans to show and identify the curb returns at the intersection of Sheridan Street and Hayden Road to have a 30-foot radius per DSPM 5-3.116.
3. Please revise the plans to show and identify the sidewalk ramps at the intersection of Sheridan Street and Hayden Road to be shared curb (corner) ramps, per COS Std. Detail #2234.

Technical Corrections

The following technical ordinance or policy related corrections have been identified in the second review of the project. While these items are not as critical to scheduling the case for public hearing, they will likely affect a decision on the final plans submittal (construction and improvement documents) and should be addressed as soon as possible. Correcting these items before the hearing may also help clarify questions regarding these plans. Please address the following:

Circulation:

4. Please revise the plans to indicate whether Sheridan Street has a separate left and right turn lane approaching Hayden Road. The site plan does identify sufficient width but does not clarify if there are two lanes proposed.

Drainage:

5. Please note that the finished floor elevation of the church building will need to be a minimum of 1-foot above the emergency overflow location for the retention basins.

Water and Wastewater:

6. Per revised subdivision plat layout modification seal dated by Thomas Weber 6/23/20 with CAD revision date 7/1/20, the new street and proposed sewer will now align with the existing manhole to allow perpendicular connection. The existing manhole will need to be modified to accept the new flows via a drop connection. The existing manhole base will need to be modified to accept the new connection flows. The existing manhole condition will need to be evaluated and may need to be rehabilitated and or coated for corrosion protection per City standards. Water Resources will need to be provided with camera inspection video of the existing manhole prior to your development of final improvement plans, in accordance with DSPM 7-.1405.

Other:

7. Please provide a clearer exhibit or plan showing the proposed zoning boundaries for easier representation of that portion of the request moving forward.

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional/supplemental information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review. The City will then review the revisions to determine if the application is to be scheduled for a hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional/supplemental information is necessary.

In an effort to get this Zoning District Map Amendment request to a Planning Commission hearing, please submit the revised material identified in Attachment A as soon as possible.

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 34 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to have the minimal information to be reviewed.

These **2nd Review Comments** are valid for a period of 180 days from the date on this letter. The Zoning Administrator may consider an application withdrawn if a revised submittal has not been received within 180 days of the date of this letter (Section 1.305. of the Zoning Ordinance).

If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me at 480-312-2376 or at jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,



Jeff Barnes
Senior Planner

**ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist**

Case Number: **18-ZN-2019**

Digital submittals shall include one copy of each item identified below.

- COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in the first review comment letter.
- Proposed zoning boundary exhibit or plan
- Revised Narrative for Project (if updated)

Site Plan/Preliminary Plat:

digital 24" x 36" 11" x 17" 8 ½" x 11"

Open Space Plan:

digital 24" x 36" 11" x 17" 8 ½" x 11"

Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation Plan:

digital 24" x 36" 11" x 17" 8 ½" x 11"

Reponses to Comments Regarding 18-ZN-2019 dated 12/5/2019

Zoning

1. The site plan has been revised to accommodate the proposed development of the R-5 property to the north after several meetings and contacts with the adjacent property owners and their representatives. The lots on the north side of the new street as it heads west from Hayden Road have been taken out and all the lots are now on the western portion of the site. This has resulted in a minor change in the size of the proposed lots as well as resulted in the reduction by one lot. This also includes the relocation of the proposed street to the north, thereby opening up the ability to share access with the proposed development to the north.

In terms of zoning, this results in a reduction of the R-4 rezoning by 0.51 acres. Therefore, under the new proposal there will remain a small portion of the existing R-5 zoning at the northeast corner while the bulk of the site would become R-4 zoning. This still represents a substantial reduction in the total area of R-5 zoning that exists on the site and brings the total site into much greater consistency with the General Plan Land Use map designations.

2. The data section of the report has been revised per the new plan concept and the site plan graphic has added the pertinent data.

Engineering

3. Retention locations have been revised.

Fire

4. Minimum drive aisle widths are identified as 24' in width.

5. Inside turning radii have been revised.

Drainage

6. Drainage Report has been revised.

7. Additional information has been provided.

8. Comments for a., b. & c. have been addressed.

9. Comments have not yet been received.

2001 General Plan and 2010 Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan Analysis:

10. The proposed plan will use the standard development standards of the R-4 district. Regarding the maximum density allowed, additional language has been added on page 18 that

addresses the history and policy context that allows for the R-4 district to fall under the Suburban Neighborhoods designation. There is no other land use designation that would properly fit this zoning district.

11. Additional language has been added under the various land use headings that address how this district implements the description of the Suburban Neighborhoods designation. The proposal is what would be labeled as a 'small lot' subdivision that is included in the language describing this land use designation.

12. A more focused current land use plan graphic has been added to the narrative. The site is in the middle of a fairly large area of Suburban Neighborhoods. In reality, the surrounding land uses are much more complex and the existing zoning pattern is not reflected in the General Plan, even though many have been in existence for decades.

13. A graphic showing where the site is within the Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan has been included.

14. The concept of adding a gate/through the fence pedestrian connection near the southwest corner of the site is noble but fraught with many issues:

- a. Such a connection was stipulated on the site plan approval for the multifamily proposal several years ago. The site plan that was approved appears to be a relatively late modification from the original site plan that was included in the variance case earlier and for the DR approval as well. The site plan that was approved shows a driveway connection to the alley within the Continental Villas subdivision, but not a sidewalk connection. It appears that this was a way to not provide a 90 foot wide turnaround for emergency and sanitation vehicles. There is no documentation that indicates the Continental Villas residents approved the break in their wall to allow this additional access. In fact, one letter received 4 months before the DR hearing clearly indicates that these residents were not aware of the possibility of such a connection. There is no record of an action by the Board of the Continental Villas Association approving such a plan. (Of note, the approved site plan did not meet the stipulations and it is not clear as to how the site plan could be adjusted to meet them.)
- b. At some point (probably in the 1990s), the Continental Villas Board was able to persuade the city to allow them to install a very substantial gate across a city alley at the southeast corner of their subdivision and raise a low section of their perimeter wall with wrought iron fencing. The gate has a 'Knox Box' to allow for emergency access. This was an unprecedented action and must have required substantial funding. The lengths to which this neighborhood has sought to control access along their eastern edge would suggest that opening this wall is not a light and easy matter. If the city desires to have this connection, it should be prepared to front this. A request from an adjacent developer would not likely be accepted. The earlier

approval of the Hayden Array project was 14 years ago and would probably have no bearing on those within this neighborhood today.

- c. The perimeter wall is a 4 inch 'Dooley' wall placed on a 1 to 1 ½ foot tall retaining stem wall. Any breach in this wall likely would require the reconstruction of a substantial segment of the wall. This applicant has no inherent right to alter or affect the wall.
- d. Pedestrian access into Continental Villas at this point would direct pedestrians down an alley that has poor sight lines/visibility as well as trash containers. It is not a facility intended to provide pedestrian access. Furthermore, at the west entrance to the Continental Villas neighborhood, the slope of the entrance from Eldorado Park and the Indian Bend Wash is steep and does not accommodate ADA access.

15. As noted, there are powerlines along 3 of the 4 perimeters of the site. The request to underground these does not meet tradition city policy nor the city's ordinances. Section 47-80(a) of the City Code specifically states that powerlines of greater capacity than 12.5 kVA are not required to be undergrounded.

- a. The powerlines along the Hayden Road frontage are 69 kVA lines, and therefore beyond the scope of the city ordinance. Furthermore, there is no room within the Hayden Road ROW to accommodate such undergrounding (There would need to be a 30 feet plus wide corridor assigned with no other utilities for a depth of probably 20 feet).
- b. The powerlines beyond the southern property line of the site are as well 69kVA lines. These are located on the adjacent church property and it is not likely they would agree to such an action.
- c. There is a 12 kVA line from the 69 kVA pole at the southeast corner of the site that crosses over the property on to the adjacent SRP property that in turn serves as the electric power connection to the church. The church would be prepared to reconstruct this service as an underground one since a new service access panel will likely be needed and the current lines actually pass over a portion of the building. (Note: The presence of the power pole in the location of the proposed Hayden Array access drive was never addressed in 2006.)
- d. There is another 12 kVA line that runs up part of the western perimeter of the site. This line starts off of another large 69 kVA pole near the southwest corner of the site and runs at a slight diagonal to a single wood pole roughly centered in the west perimeter of the church property. From this pole the powerlines cross over the property line an extend to a pole located within the Continental Villas subdivision at least 100 feet north of the site. There is a 2 ½ to 3 feet grade change across the property line where the one pole is situated. The applicant would be able to control the first section of power lines, but it is likely the pole would need to remain in place, rendering much of the effect of undergrounding moot. This is a very unusual situation.

#16- Updated Citizen Involvement Report that describes the key issues that have been identified through the public involvement process.

- Working with neighboring property to the north (APN 131-23-003C) to update our site layout to allow both of us to develop our sites without zoning conflicts. We had a complete overhaul of our site plan to alleviate this issue.
 - We have had numerous conversations and meetings with the owner to the north to come to an agreement on a site plan layout that will allow both projects to be developable. We are still in communication with them as we are working on a potential access point for them to use as secondary ingress/egress.
 - Our site plan has been changed significantly to allow the owner to the north to proceed with their plan generally as previously approved. This has caused us to remove all lots that were along the northern property boundary and internalize all our lots, so they do not abut their property at all.
 - By moving our ingress/egress to the north it allows for us to reconfigure our community away from Hayden and not have a zoning conflict with the owners to the north.
 - We have been having ongoing conversations about how we can work together to help one another to make both of our projects as efficient and developable as possible.
 - If requested property owners to the north would be willing to provide a letter of support for our community, and we are willing to do the same for them.

Circulation and Engineering

17. Curb returns of 25' radius are shown. If the returns are enlarged to 30' radius, the existing gas meter will be required to be relocated.
18. The revision to the sidewalk as requested is now shown.
19. The revision to the sidewalk connection as requested is now shown.
20. The parking drive aisles will comply with the appropriate city standards per Section 9.106 of the Zoning Ordinance.
21. The site distance triangles are shown.
22. The church water service has been added, with a note regarding reduced pressure principal backflow preventor. Sewer will be serviced by a new line.

Circulation

23. Two lanes are provided.
24. Church parking lot has been revised.

Engineering

25. Residential lots shall have refuse collection provided by individual canisters. The church shall have a dumpster.
26. Acknowledged.
27. Sheridan Street is identified as public.
28. Acknowledged.



12/5/2019

Chris Brown
Residential Pursuits Investments, LLC
7600 E Doubletree Ranch Rd Ste 130
Scottsdale, Az

RE: 18-ZN-2019
Scottsdale Nazarene Rezoning
1684H (Key Code)

Dear Mr. Brown:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 11/7/2019. The following **1st Review Comments** represent the review performed by our team, and is intended to provide you with guidance for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application.

Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues

The following code and ordinance related issues have been identified in the first review of this application, and shall be addressed in the resubmittal of the revised application material. Addressing these items is critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, and may affect the City Staff's recommendation. Please address the following:

Zoning:

1. The northeast portion of this site abuts an R-5 development (APN 131-23-003C) that had previously received (32-DR-2015/367-SA-2017 expired) DRB approval for, and has reapplied for, a site design that utilizes the current R-5 abutting R-5 zero setback along their south property boundary. The proposed change in zoning for your site would require the adjacent R-5 property to maintain a 15-foot landscaped setback abutting the proposed resulting R-4 for this project, per Section 5.1004.E.1 and 10.602.A.1.b. The proposed zoning change would also have the effect of limiting that adjacent R-5 development to a single-story within 50-feet of the south boundary of their site, per Section 5.1004.C.2. Both elements conflict with the previous and current development proposals for that site.
 - a. Please revise your proposal to eliminate negative zoning related impacts to surrounding properties. Some mitigation options may include adjustments to the zoning boundaries to retain a portion of R-5 or propose a portion of O-S. Please see the general concept graphics included in the uploaded case materials associated to this idea.

2. Please provide an overall site plan for the zoning application that gives the development standards breakdown for each proposed component (residential portion and church portion) and the cumulative total of those details for the entire site. This information is provided in different tables within the narrative but should also be reflected on a project site plan.

Engineering:

3. In accordance with Scottsdale Revised Code - Chapter 47: Retention for this project may not be placed within the Public Right-of-Way. Please update the proposed plans accordingly.

Fire:

4. Please revise the plans to label and identify minimum drive aisle widths of 24-feet, in accordance with Fire Ord. 4283 503.2.1
5. Please revise the plans to label and identify minimum inside turning radius for emergency vehicle access is 25-feet, in accordance with DSPM 2-1.303(5).

Drainage:

6. Please submit copies of the revised Drainage Report with the rest of the resubmittal material as identified in Attachment A.

The content and analysis requirements for case or preliminary drainage reports in support of more conceptual development applications such as general plan amendments and zoning applications are not the same as those for case drainage reports in support of development review or preliminary plat applications. The City requires significantly less information and analysis for the former due to the preliminary nature of these applications. In accordance with the City's Design Standards and Policies Manual (DSPM) preliminary drainage reports submitted in support of the more conceptual applications should include a 50% level of design and analysis including a preliminary grading and drainage plan to allow review and evaluation of the major drainage elements relating to a proposed project by City staff. Case drainage reports submitted in support of preliminary plat and development review applications should include a 75% level of design and analysis including a preliminary grading and drainage plan to allow an analysis of the viability of the proposed project and an in-depth evaluation of the function and design of the stormwater management system by City staff. Upon application of a development review application for this development, the case drainage report will need to be updated to meet the 75% level requirement.

7. The preliminary drainage report and grading and drainage plan (G&D plan) should provide additional information to verify that the proposed retention facilities are sufficient to meet the stormwater storage requirements of the site. For example:
 - a. Provide a drainage map with tributary drainage areas that define which parts of the site drain to each of the four retention basins. Does the entire site drain to the basin in Tract "A" or do some parts of the site drain to the three smaller retention basins? Explain in the drainage report and clarify on the plans.
 - b. For the three smaller retention basins, provide the volume, HWSEL, and emergency outfall elevation.
8. Additional comments on the G&D Plan are as follows:
 - a. Provide additional proposed grade information (and drainage arrows) around the parking lot area so that proposed drainage patterns can be verified.
 - b. Some lots have FF elevations, whereas others do not. Please explain.

- c. Label the FF of the church.

Water and Waste Water:

9. Please submit copies of the revised Water and Waste Water Design Report(s) with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A.

The review of the BOD's is still ongoing at the time of issuance of this letter. Those comments will be provided as soon as they are available

Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of this application. While these issues may not be critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, they may affect the City Staff's recommendation pertaining to the application and should be addressed with the resubmittal of the revised application material. Please address the following:

2001 General Plan and 2010 Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan (SSCAP) Analysis:

10. The Proposed Residential Development table on pages 9 and 10 isn't clear as to what development standards the applicant is seeking. In particular, the table notes the maximum density that could be achieved on the subject site as a result of the R-4 district – resulting in a density outside of the Suburban Neighborhood land use designation range. With a resubmittal, please clarify the maximum development standards being sought, with narrative discussion supporting such.
11. Page 13 discusses the existing land use designation of Suburban Neighborhoods but does not provide clarity as to how the proposed zoning category and housing type implement this particular land use designation. With a resubmittal, provide further narrative response as to how the proposal implements the existing Suburban Neighborhoods land use designation, please include discussion related to the proposed maximum density, housing type, and relationship to the surrounding context area.
12. With a resubmittal, please provide a more-focused General Plan land use exhibit that notes the subject site's designation in relation to neighboring properties. The graphic included on page 13 of the narrative is focused on Southern Scottsdale, which does not provide context to the subject site and the existing land use designation.
13. With a resubmittal, please provide a Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan exhibit that notes the subject site's location in relation to the Character Area boundary.
14. The 2001 General Plan (Land Use Element Goal 5, bullet 6, Goal 7, Goal 8, and Goal 9, bullet 4; Economic Vitality Element Goal 5, bullet 6; Neighborhoods Element Goal 4, bullet 7; Open Space Element Goal 1, bullets 11, 14, and 17; and, Community Mobility Element Goals 10 and Goal 11) and the Southern Scottsdale Character Area Plan (Land Use Chapter Policy LU 8.2; Character & Design Chapter Goal CD 5; Community Mobility Chapter Policy CM 1.3 and Goal CM 4; Open Space & Recreation Chapter Policy OSR 2.6; and, Preservation & Environmental Planning Chapter Policy PE 1.3) place great importance on the pedestrian experience, linkages within and between development sites, and how these connections interact with, and complement, open spaces – such as the Indian Bend Wash.
 - a. A previously-approved case for the southern portion of the subject site (Case 32-DR-2006, "Hayden Array") provided pedestrian access through the east-west alleyway

located south of East Vernon Avenue – thus incorporating an important pedestrian linkage between neighborhoods, and ultimately to the Indian Bend Wash.

- b. The first submittal narrative states, in response to General Plan 2001 Land Use Element Goal 7 that, “there is no opportunity to further integrate” with the surrounding neighborhoods; however, previously approved case history provides greater integration than what is being proposed. With a resubmittal, incorporate sidewalk and pedestrian access south of proposed lot 21 through the east-west alleyway south of East Vernon Avenue. This will further integrate the proposed site plan with existing neighborhoods and provide access to a major community amenity – the Indian Bend Wash.
15. The 2001 General Plan Public Services and Facilities (Goal 3, bullet 4) and SSCAP Public Services & Facilities Chapter (Policy PSF 3.3) identify the importance of coordinated infrastructure efforts – particularly those concerning the undergrounding of powerlines. There are existing powerlines that border the western, southern, and eastern perimeter of the subject site. Please confirm that powerlines adjacent to the subject site will be undergrounded in conjunction with the development request as this would benefit both existing and future residents.
 16. 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.

Circulation and Engineering:

17. The curb returns at the intersection of Sheridan Street and Hayden Road should have a 30-foot radius, per DSPM 5-3.116, and utilize shared curb (corner) ramps, per COS Std. Detail #2234. Please revise the plans accordingly.
18. Please revise the site plan to identify the installation of an 8-foot wide sidewalk, separated from the back of curb, along the entire Hayden Road frontage of this project site, per DSPM 5.3101, 5-3.110, and 5-8.206.
19. Please revise the site plan to identify the sidewalk connection from the church building to Sheridan Street and to Hayden Road to be a minimum of 6-feet wide, per DSPM 2-1.808 and 2.1310.
20. In accordance with DSPM 2-1.303, please revise the plans to identify a minimum 24-foot drive aisle width for the church parcel.
21. Please update the plans with the required site distance triangles meeting the specifications of DSPM 5-3.123.D.
22. Please update the preliminary plat to show and identify the church water and sewer service locations, per DSPM Chapter 6 and 7. The Church’s water meter will require a reduced pressure principal backflow preventor.

Technical Corrections

The following technical ordinance or policy related corrections have been identified in the first review of the project. While these items are not as critical to scheduling the case for public hearing, they will likely affect a decision on the final plans submittal (construction and improvement documents) and should be addressed as soon as possible. Correcting these items

before the hearing may also help clarify questions regarding these plans. Please address the following:

Circulation:

23. Please revise the plans to indicate whether Sheridan Street has a separate left and right turn lane approaching Hayden Road. The site plan does not indicate two lanes but there appears to be enough width provided.
24. Traffic direction in the angled parking church parking lot is one-way, not two-way as shown on the Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation Plan. Please update the Circulation Plan accordingly. Please revise the plans to show the dimensions for the parking spaces and aisle widths.

Engineering:

25. In accordance with Scottsdale Revised Code - Section 24-13: All waste shall be placed in suitable containers to facilitate waste removal in a sanitary condition. Please clarify how refuse collection is anticipated to be handled for both land uses and label the refuse enclosure location(s) on the plans as applicable.
26. In accordance with Scottsdale Revised Code - Chapter 48: Covenant to construct and assurances for public infrastructure will be required prior to final plat recordation.
27. In accordance with Scottsdale Revised Code - Chapter 48: Sheridan Street is required to be a public street. Please clarify the identification of that on the proposed site plan.
28. Per DSPM 6-1.202 and 7-1.201, the Preliminary Basis of Design Reports must be reviewed and accepted by the Water Resources Department prior to zoning approval.

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional/supplemental information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review. The City will then review the revisions to determine if the application is to be scheduled for a hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional/supplemental information is necessary.

PLEASE CALL 480-312-7767 TO SCHEDULE A RESUBMITTAL MEETING WITH ME PRIOR TO YOUR PLANNED RESUBMITTAL DATE. DO NOT DROP OFF ANY RESUBMITTAL MATERIAL WITHOUT A SCHEDULED MEETING. THIS WILL HELP MAKE SURE I'M AVAILABLE TO REVIEW YOUR RESUBMITTAL AND PREVENT ANY UNNECESSARY DELAYS. RESUBMITTAL MATERIAL THAT IS DROPPED OFF MAY NOT BE ACCEPTED AND RETURNED TO THE APPLICANT.

In an effort to get this Zoning District Map Amendment request to a Planning Commission hearing, please submit the revised material identified in Attachment A as soon as possible.

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 18 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to have the minimal information to be reviewed.

These **1st Review Comments** are valid for a period of 180 days from the date on this letter. The Zoning Administrator may consider an application withdrawn if a revised submittal has not been received within 180 days of the date of this letter (Section 1.305. of the Zoning Ordinance).

If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me at 480-312-2376 or at jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jeff Barnes', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jeff Barnes
Senior Planner

ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: **18-ZN-2019**

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the resubmittal (all plans larger than 8 ½ x11 shall be folded):

Digital submittals shall include one copy of each item identified below.

- One copy: COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in the first review comment letter.
- One copy: Revised Narrative for Project
- One copy: Updated Citizen Involvement Report

Site Plan/Preliminary Plat:

_____ digital _____ 24" x 36" _____ 11" x 17" _____ 8 ½" x 11"

Open Space Plan:

_____ digital _____ 24" x 36" _____ 11" x 17" _____ 8 ½" x 11"

Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation Plan:

_____ digital _____ 24" x 36" _____ 11" x 17" _____ 8 ½" x 11"

Technical Reports: Please include one (1) digital copy with each report

- Digital copy of Revised Drainage Report:
- Digital copy of Revised Water Design Report:
- Digital copy of Revised Waste Water Design Report:

Resubmit the revised Drainage Reports, Water and Waste Water Report and/or Storm Water Waiver application to your Project Coordinator with any prior City mark-up documents.