

Applicant Response Letter May 2023

Staff Issued 2nd Review: 3/15/2023

RE: **Case Number: 13-ZN-2022**

The Parque

3993D (Key Code)

Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revise Code Significant Issues

The following code and ordinance related issues have been identified in the second 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. *First Review Comment #11:* It appears the proposed project will be developed in multiple phases. If so, please provide a Development Master Plan in accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 7.830. as required by Section 5.4003.C. *Please see redline comments on development plan sheets "subdivision plan" and "conceptual phasing plan".*

Response: Updated plans included with resubmittal.

2. *First Review Comment #12:* In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 5.4008.H., a development agreement is required if Special Improvements are proposed with the use of the bonus provisions. Please provide a development agreement which meets the requirements of this section. *The development agreement is in review with planning, MAPS, and the City Attorney's office. Comments and coordination are forthcoming.*

Response: Updated Development Agreement included with resubmittal.

3. *First Review Comment #13:* The proposed application includes a request to include the Planned Shared Development (PSD) overlay district on the subject parcel. Please revise the project narrative to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the PSD overlay (Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1400., including any proposal for transfer of development rights. Please provide an accompanying development agreement in accordance with the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section

6.1406.C.1. *The development agreement is in review with planning, MAPS, and the City Attorney's office. Comments and coordination are forthcoming.*

Response: Updated Development Agreement included with the resubmittal.

4. *First Review Comment #15:* Please provide bicycle parking space racks per City of Scottsdale Zoning Ordinance Article IX. – Parking and Loading Requirements, Sec. 9.103. - Parking requirements and show on site plan. Bicycle racks to be located near front entrances of the restaurant, office and hotel locations ((6) spaces, (3) racks should be sufficient for each building site location). Bicycle racks can blend with the architectural context of development. Please contact Transportation Department to ensure functionality of racks and dimension of placement prior to installation, or utilize City of Scottsdale Standard Detail #2285. *There do not appear to be any racks located near Blocks A or C. Please provide racks near these buildings. Please also provide detail regarding bike racks or bike storage locations for the residents of the multifamily buildings.*

Response: Bicycle parking information added to Vehicle Circulation Plan.

Engineering:

5. *First Review Comment #16:* SRC: Provide an infrastructure phasing plan that addresses the sequencing of city staff required public improvements, or all improvements will be required at time of first permit. (public infrastructure = water, sewer, streets, fire + refuse circulation and access, bus bays, shelters, sidewalks, signals, streetlights, etc) Additionally, please make sure to account for required looping of water lines, no circulating drive aisle dead ends, continuous sidewalks, refuse servicing etc, when determining appropriate phasing limits or the infrastructure required to be provided within each phase. *This was not adequately addressed with the provided subdivision plan or development agreement. Provisions assuring this will be accounted for in any phasing of project or platting needs to be accounted for. See redline comments on development plan sheets "subdivision plan" and "conceptual phasing plan".*

Response: Infrastructure (roads, sidewalks, refuse, water, sewer, etc.) will coincide with the adjacent phase. Per meeting with City Staff on 5/8 multiple phasing scenarios were shown and discussed, which are included with this resubmittal for reference. It was agreed that a stipulation will be drafted to memorialize the phased infrastructure approach.

6. *First Review Comment #17:* SRC 48: PLATTING.

- a. Please update SUBDIVISION PLAN to identify Block G's frontage to a public street. Additionally, more visibly illustrate the proposed parcel's boundaries; if proposed to be malleable, add a note unto subdivision plan that any modifications to proposed parcel lines will be in accordance with existing code provisions at time of zoning approval.
- b. Infrastructure, serving multiple parcels, will need to be contained within its appropriate easements. Site development design to respect their associated limitations (ie, no drainage or dry utilities within WSFs). Add note to SUBDIVISION PLAN stating conceptual site and building designs, + intensity, will be modified to accommodate city required, and provide city compliant, infrastructure design and easements accordingly.

Street tracts will be required. Update subdivision plan accordingly, with dimensions and amenities.

Response: Updated plan included with resubmittal.

Drainage:

7. *First Review Comment #25:* Please submit a revised Drainage Report with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A. Redlined reports are available for download via the case file exchange. *Review of the resubmitted drainage report is outstanding. Comments will be forwarded when available.*

Response: SEG coordinating with Stormwater directly.

Water and Wastewater:

8. *First Review Comment #26:* Please submit a revised Water and Wastewater Design Report(s) with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A. Redlined reports are available for download via the case file exchange. *Please see the 2nd review redlined sewer BOD report.*

Response: Updated Sewer BOD included with resubmittal.

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:

Site Design:

9. *First Review Comment #28:* To create greater emphasis at the corners of the project along N. Dial Boulevard, please revise the project plans to create an open space area at the intersections of Paradise Lane/Dial Boulevard and Tierra Buena Lane/Dial Boulevard. *Please provide clarification of the response provided. These areas are not clearly shown on the resubmitted plans.*

Response: See updated Landscape Plan and Development Plan booklet.

10. *First Review Comment #29:* To assist in review of the provided Transition Plan, please provide additional cross-sections at other areas on the northern and southern portions of the site on the Transition Plan. *Please revise the provided Transition Sections to indicate the required setback and stepback requirements for the site.*

Response: Updated Transition Plans provided with resubmittal.

11. *First Review Comment #34:* DSPM 2-1.309 REFUSE COLLECTION: Update refuse plan to address the following: *This has not been adequately addressed. Please see redlines on Development Plan file and resubmit accordingly (provide typical horizontal and vertical clearances).*
 - a. The proposed refuse solution will only work if the project is being zoned with a planned development type designation and associated sharing of facilities DA requirements. If not, please delete blue dots from refuse plan and instead add green dots, trash compactor locations to each block.
 - b. If planned development, add note define how trash from each refuse service area is to be taken to trash compactor location. Add a blue dot detail. Once we review this information, the city may determine the currently proposed refuse solution non-feasible for project and require trash compactor dots within each block.
 - c. Add a green dot within the boundaries of proposed Phase 1.
 - d. Add a typ. Refuse, green dot, detail to include a horizontal compactor, associated dimensioning and required vertical and horizontal clearances. If proposed refuse solution is approved, 1 overall green dot, the green dot detail will need to account for 70 cubic yards of

- compacted trash.
- e. Will there be any recycling provided to project? If so, add a 'doting' solution for it.
 - f. Add note, stating that conceptual site and building designs + intensity will be modified to accommodate city required, and provide city compliant, refuse design.
 - g. If planned development, add a note stating that each phase preceding Block F, current green dot location, will provide its own trash compactor refuse solution.
 - h. Update plan to account for required restaurant grease containers.
 - i. Applicant to note, updated refuse plan, per provided comments, still needs to be reviewed for approval. Another review cycle, post next submittal, will be required should refuse plan not be updated per staff comments or if updated but not approved.

Response: Updated Refuse Plan included with the resubmittal (2 sheets).

12. **2nd Review New Comment:** The site plan has changed from the 1st to 2nd Submittal eliminating the break in the building façade for the hotel and restaurant buildings that was present along N. Scottsdale Road in the 1st Submittal. This change creates a long, continuous façade that is over 200 feet in length without breaks. Please revise the project plans to provide a break in the building façade for the northwest building on the site.

Response: Plans have been updated to address the long façade.

Circulation:

13. **First Review Comment #45:** Modify the existing pavement marking on Dial Boulevard at Monte Cristo to make the southbound approach a two-way left-turn lane, not a southbound left-turn lane. The existing layout does not allow northbound left turns at the proposed site driveway. *Not shown; still need to do this for northbound left turns into the site at this driveway.*

Response: Vehicular Circulation Plan is noted accordingly.

14. **First Review Comment #46:** Provide a preliminary design for the Tierra Buena Land and Scottsdale Road intersection to accommodate the proposed traffic signal. Include the pavement marking and lane line lengths for all legs of the intersection. Applicant will be responsible for adding pavement marking to the west leg, located in the City of Phoenix. *Not showing the west leg.*

Response: Vehicular Circulation Plan is noted accordingly.

TIMA:

15. **First Review Comment #60:** Page 60, please include turn lane recommendations and lengths in this section. Were Please re-evaluate these lengths under the proposed signalized condition at Scottsdale Road/Tierra Buena Lane.? *Not adequately addressed.*
16. **2nd Review New Comment:** The trip generation comparison still appears to not use what the proposed land uses were in the previous case. Please revise to use the previous proposed Parque site, not land uses that fit the existing zoning. The existing CrackerJax site should also be used in the comparison.
17. **2nd Review New Comment:** Section 9 does not appear to recommend the installation of a traffic signal based on the calculated warrants but is recommended in the conclusion. Revise to include the recommendation in each section.

Response for 16 thru 18: See revised TIMA included with the resubmittal.