



March 31, 2008

Tom Rief
Land Development Services LLC
5635 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 130
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: 9-DR-2008
3500 Toscana

Dear Mr. Rief:

The Planning and Development Services Department has completed the review of the above referenced submittal dated February 21, 2008. The following **1st Review Comments** represent the review performed on the project by our team, and are intended to provide you with guidance for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application type.

Key Issues

In an effort to direct your attention to the most significant issues which need resolution, staff has provided the following section to help prioritize and/or guide you to the “big picture” concerns and/or issues which need resolution:

- Fitting in the context of the area – There are several comments below in the zoning section which speak to the issues of zoning compliance. This proposed site plan is unimaginative. Further, it is unresponsive to the existing content and the approved master plan for the Civic Center. The policy section offers suggestions to address issues pertaining to circulation patterns, site driveways and pedestrian corridors.
- Quality of Architecture – The quality of architecture is generic. There are several comments below in the policy section which offer suggestions to address the issues of mass and bulk of the units, building orientation and materials.
- Feasibility of Landscape – The conceptual landscape plan appears to be infeasible, as the entire site will be a concrete deck located above a subterranean parking garage.

Ordinance Related Issues

The following ordinance related issues have been identified in this first review of the project and will need to be addressed in a re-submittal prior to scheduling a hearing.

Zoning/Legal/Submittal Requirements:

1. Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1207.C., spacing between two buildings on the same site shall not be less than 10 percent of the larger building's two longest adjacent sides at the space. The site plan shows insufficient spacing between: buildings 1 and 2; buildings 2 and 3; buildings 3 and 4; buildings 3 and 5; and buildings 4 and 5. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.

2. Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1207.B., a rear setback of at least 25 feet is required when adjacent to multi-family residential. The plans show 24 feet. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
3. Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1207.B., for the building envelope, starting at a point 26 feet above the building setback line, the inclined stepback plane slopes at 2:1 on the street frontages and 1:1 on the other sides of a property. Provide cross sections for all four sides of the property, and show the 1:1 stepback plan as well as the 2:1 stepback plane.
4. Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1207.B., maximum building height is 36 feet. Identify the proposed building heights on the elevations, and provide elevations for all four sides of all buildings.
5. Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 9.105, required mobility impaired accessible parking spaces shall be provided at the rate of four percent of the total required vehicular parking spaces. Based on total required vehicular parking of 194 spaces, eight accessible spaces are required; the site plan identifies six. The van loading space must be on the right side of the parking stall. Revise the site plan accordingly.
6. Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 9.103.B., bicycle parking spaces shall be provided at a rate of one bicycle parking space per every 10 required vehicular parking spaces. Based on total required vehicular parking of 194 spaces, a total of 20 bicycle parking spaces are required; the site plan identifies 17. Revise the site plan accordingly.
7. It appears the lot area data of 182,885 square feet gross and 150,628 square feet net has not been calculated correctly. Based on the ALTA Survey, staff has identified the gross land area at 186,991.73 square feet and net acreage at 144,256.72 square feet. Update the plans and project data accordingly.

Circulation:

8. Show existing driveways on adjacent properties as well as across Miller Road and Osborn Road.
9. Show site distance triangles at proposed driveway locations. Revise the site plan accordingly.
10. An additional 10-foot right-of-way dedication to the City standard of 50 feet is required on Osborn Road. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
11. An additional two-foot alley dedication to the standard 20-foot width is required. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
12. The refuse enclosure proposal is not acceptable. Identify how residents will get to the trash enclosures. Enclosures must be at a 30-degree angle to the alley. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.

Fire:

13. Maintain a minimum 20-foot wide emergency access on the west alley.

Drainage:

14. Plan Check # 1053-08. Please submit two (2) copies of the revised Drainage Report with the original red-lined copy of the report to the One-Stop Shop

Water and Waste Water:

15. Plan Check #1054-8. Please submit three (3) copies of the revised Water and Waste Water Design Report(s) with the original red-lined copy of the report to the One-Stop Shop

Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of the project. While these issues are not as critical to scheduling the case for public hearing, they may affect the City Staff's recommendation for support of this project and should be addressed as soon as possible.

16. Please have all property owners sign the attached Proposition 207 Waiver form and return the original with the resubmittal.

Site Design:

17. Proposed driveway locations are not acceptable. Consolidate access to Osborn with the existing alley, and align the ramp on Miller Road with the driveway across the street. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
18. Provide a pedestrian corridor along the alley at the western frontage of the site by providing an alley width of 24 feet and utilizing the easternmost eight feet as a pedestrian path. Pavement surface for the vehicle lane and the pedestrian path should be consistent, without grade separation, but with paving materials that will differentiate the lane from the path. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
19. Along the north edge of the site, provide a 32-foot wide pedestrian corridor that will serve as a link in the pedestrian connection between Scottsdale Civic Center Mall and the access to the Indian Bend Wash on Osborn Road. This is based on the revised master plan for the Civic Center that was approved by the City Council in 1990, Case 22-UP-90.
20. Angle the pedestrian path in a southeasterly direction as it approaches Miller Road in order to avoid conflicts with the proposed ramp to the subterranean parking garage.
21. Along both the Miller Road and Osborn Road frontages, provide a pedestrian corridor that has an eight-foot wide landscape strip between the back of curb and sidewalk, then an eight-foot wide sidewalk, then another eight-foot wide landscape strip between the sidewalk and any security barriers that might surround the site.
22. At the perimeter of the site, the proposed site plan appears to indicate a fence that is located between the face of the buildings and the sidewalk. Shift the location of the fence so that it aligns with the face of the buildings that will be at the street edges of the site.
23. Widen Miller Road in front of the site to accommodate a bike lane and right-turn lane (four feet) at Osborn Road. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
24. Site driveways must conform to City standard detail CL-1 with transition. The sidewalk must be constructed around the driveway ramp per the detail. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
25. Extend the sidewalk along Miller Road across the southern site driveway, and provide accessible ramps and sidewalk in the island to make it more pedestrian friendly. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
26. Construct new accessible ramps at the northwest corner of Miller and Osborn Roads. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
27. Identify whether or not parking garage entrances will be gated, and if so, provide sufficient detail to identify the gate locations and provide a turn-around in front of the gates. Revise the site and landscape plans accordingly.
28. Show bicycle parking spaces on both the site and landscape plans.
29. Convert all overhead utility lines to underground utility lines.

Elevation Design:

30. Modify building elevations so that mass and bulk of the dwelling units will be a transitional form, with lower-story bulk at the street edges of the site, which increases at the western half of the site.
31. Modify the building elevations so that dwelling units face the streets and pedestrian corridors (i.e., front porches or stoops), if they are adjacent to Miller Road, Osborn Road, the alley and pedestrian corridor. This configuration will activate the streets and blend with the development of the community.

32. Modify the building elevations based on the following:

- Utilize a variety of textures on the wall surfaces;
- Provide a frame around the edges of, and/or recess, the east, south and west facing windows so that there is a shade device that is 12 – 18 inches deep;
- Utilize stone veneer materials in a more consistent manner, massing and portions of the building, i.e., as a base or a strong corner element.

Lighting Design:

33. Show locations of building mounted and free standing exterior light fixtures on both the site and landscape plans.

34. Coordinate the landscape plan with the lighting plan in order to avoid conflicts between lights and mature-size trees and shrubs.

35. To avoid conflicts between the size of mature trees and light fixtures, shift either the location of trees or the location of light fixtures that there is at least 20 feet between tree trunks and light fixtures.

Landscape Design:

36. If the entire site will be a concrete deck located above a subterranean parking garage, then the conceptual landscape plan is questionable. Provide site sections so that City staff may better understand the infrastructure that will support the proposed landscape improvements.

37. Provide a double row of trees along the Miller Road and Osborn Road frontages.

Technical Corrections

The following technical 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 the final plans submittal (construction set) and should be addressed as soon as possible. Correcting these items before the hearing may also help clarify questions regarding these plans.

Lighting:

38. Street lights are required. Additional information will come by separate cover.

Please resubmit the revised Drainage Report, Water and Waste Water Design Report(s), revised plans, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review (**Please see Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, for a consolidated list of information to be resubmitted**). The City will then review the revisions to determine if it is ready to be scheduled for a hearing date.

In an effort to get this development request to a Development Review Board hearing, City staff has identified the following potential schedules (read schedule left to right):

Track	Response/resubmittal by applicant (complete set of revisions)	City to provide status update	Potential DRB Hearing Date
12-08	No later than 4/10/2008	4/24/2008	6/5/2008*
13-08	No later than 4/25/2008	5/8/2008	6/19/2008*
14-08	No later than 5/9/2008	5/23/2008	7/10/2008*

*The above-referenced schedule reflects the timing for a typical DRB case. However, the companion abandonment case for this project, 13-AB-2007, must go to Planning Commission for a recommendation, and then to the City Council for final action, prior to Development Review Board action on the DRB case, 9-DR-2008. Once the City Council has taken action on the abandonment case, action can be taken by the Development Review Board. It is staff's intent to

process both cases concurrently, and I will keep you apprised of timing considerations in that regard.

PLEASE CALL 480-312-7000 TO SCHEDULE A RESUBMITTAL MEETING WITH ME PRIOR TO YOUR PLANNED RESUBMITTAL DATE. DO NOT DROP OFF ANY RESUBMITTAL MATERIAL WITHOUT A SCHEDULED MEETING OR THE ABOVE MEETING SCHEDULE MAY BE AFFECTED. THIS WILL HELP MAKE SURE I'M AVAILABLE TO REVIEW YOUR RESUBMITTAL AND PREVENT ANY UNNECESSARY DELAYS.

This schedule is based on the original submittal track and relies on a timely, complete and accurate response/resubmittal to the items addressed in this letter. Please be advised that the **1st Review Comments** are valid for a period of 45 days from the date on this letter. While the case will remain active, failure to resubmit within the 45 days will require the project to begin a new "First Review" track to refresh the review. Failure to resubmit within 190 days may cause the project to be considered inactive.

If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me at 480-312-7734 or at kchafin@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,

Kim Chafin, AICP
Senior Planner

cc: John Lupypciw
Mayfield Real Estate
20701 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 107
Scottsdale, AZ 85255

Julia Fuller
Acanthus Architecture
4222 E. 12th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, AZ 85014

Dave Nykorchuk
DNA INC
340 E. Willetta Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Continental Group
8787 E Mountain View
Scottsdale, AZ 85258

**ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist**

Case Number: 9-DR-2008

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the first submittal (all plans larger than 8 1/2 x11 shall be folded):

- One copy: COVER LETTER- Respond to all the issues identified in the first review comment letter.
- One copy: Revised CD of submittal (DWG format only)
- One original: Signed Prop. 207 Waiver Request
- One copy: Revised Project Data Sheet
- One copy: Revised Narrative for Project

Revised Site Plan:

_____ 7 _____ 24" x 36" _____ 1 _____ 11" x 17" _____ 1 _____ 8 1/2" x 11"

Revised Elevations:

Color _____ 3 _____ 24" x 36" _____ 1 _____ 11" x 17" _____ 1 _____ 8 1/2" x 11"
 B/W _____ 3 _____ 24" x 36" _____ 1 _____ 11" x 17" _____ 1 _____ 8 1/2" x 11"

Revised Landscape Plan:

Color _____ 3 _____ 24" x 36" _____ 1 _____ 11" x 17" _____ 1 _____ 8 1/2" x 11"
 B/W _____ 3 _____ 24" x 36" _____ 1 _____ 11" x 17" _____ 1 _____ 8 1/2" x 11"

Other Supplemental Materials:

- Building cross-sections showing inclined stepback plane
- Site cross-sections showing relationship between proposed landscaping and subterranean garage

Technical Reports:

2 copies of Revised Drainage Report: Plan Check No. 1053-08
 3 copies of Revised Water & Wastewater Design Plan Check No. 1054-08
 Reports

Resubmit the revised Drainage Reports, Water and Waste Water Report to the One-Stop Shop (Permit Services Counter) with any prior City mark-up documents; these are *not to be submitted to the Project Coordinator, Planner or Engineer.* The report(s) and/or waiver(s) must be logged in by our Permit Services Counter representatives at the One Stop Shop. The Project Coordinators, Planners and Engineers cannot accept the documents or log them into City's case review system.

Your Project Coordinator will verify that the applicable report(s) and/or waiver(s) have been resubmitted at the resubmittal meeting. If these report(s) and/or waiver(s) have not been resubmitted, your resubmittal of this application may be declined.

To assist City Staff, and to facilitate your resubmittal process, please have your engineer prepare the resubmittal of the Drainage Report, Water and Waste Water Reports and/or Storm Water Waiver application with the following information on the cover page:

Name of Project: _____

Contact: **Applicant/Agent or Engineer-- (telephone number) and (email address)**

Report Type: **(Drainage Report, Water and Waste Water Reports and/or Storm Water Waiver application)**

Case Number: _____

Plan Check Number: _____

If you do not print the information above on the corresponding report, please bring a copy of the information with you so that the Permit Services Representative can enter the correct data and accept your submittal for processing. Without the basic information identified, the resubmittal cannot accept for review.