

To: Town of Paradise Valley
6401 E Lincoln Drive
Paradise Valley, Arizona 85253



From: Eric Maceyko
EPS Group, Inc.
1130 N. Alma School Rd., Ste. 120
Mesa, AZ 85201

Date: July 15, 2022

Re: **Andaz Scottsdale Resort and Bungalows**
Trip Generation Comparison – FIRST REVISION

An expansion of the current Andaz Scottsdale Resort & Bungalows development is being proposed on a 5-acre parcel adjacent to the southwest corner of the existing resort. The proposed development will be comprised of 10 resort villa rental units. They will include four two-bedroom units of approximately 2,100 square feet, five three-bedroom units of approximately 2,600 square feet and one four-bedroom unit of approximately 4,000 square feet. Access to the new development will be provided solely through the existing resort property. No direct vehicular or pedestrian access to / from the adjacent Quail Run Road is planned. A copy of the site plan is attached to this letter.

A previous traffic analysis was conducted for a potential redevelopment of the entire property (inclusive of the 5-acre parcel) that included different uses for this site. The *Cottonwoods Resort Traffic and Parking Impact Analysis* was completed in September 2013 by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. The previously planned development for the 5-acre site included single-family resort residential dwelling units. A copy of the pertinent excerpts from this study are attached to this letter.

The estimated trip generation for the previously approved and currently proposed development was determined through the procedures and data contained within the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation*, 11th Edition, published in September 2021. This document provides traffic volume data from existing developments throughout North America that can be utilized to estimate vehicle trips that might be generated from developments. The traffic data are provided for 179 different categories, or Land Use Codes (LUC). The estimated traffic volume is dependent upon independent variables defined by the characteristics and size of each LUC. It should be noted that all data plots and statistics presented in the manual are based on data collected prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Trip generation was conducted as detailed below.

The most appropriate data to estimate trips for the previous development are provided by ITE Land Use Code 210 – Single-Family Detached Housing. Since the previous report considered the entire site as a whole, the proportion of the total trip generation for the single-family resort residential uses was utilized as a function of the individual 5-acre site (approximately 19 single-family dwelling units). The complete calculation results for the previously planned land use are summarized in the following table:

Table 1: Total Trip Generation – Previous Development

DESCRIPTION OF LAND USE				VEHICLE GENERATED TRIPS						
				Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
Land Use	ITE LUC	SIZE		Total	Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total
Resort Residential	210	19	DU	219	4	12	16	13	8	21

The most appropriate data to estimate trips for the proposed development are provided by ITE Land Use Code 330 – Resort Hotel. The complete calculation results for the new proposed land use are summarized in the following table:

Table 2: Total Trip Generation – Proposed Development

DESCRIPTION OF LAND USE				VEHICLE GENERATED TRIPS						
				Daily	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
Land Use	ITE LUC	SIZE		Total	Enter	Exit	Total	Enter	Exit	Total
Resort Hotel	330	10	Units	80*	2	1	3	2	2	4

**no daily trip data available for LUC 330, so data from LUC 310 (Hotel) was utilized as a substitute*

Copies of the trip generation output sheets are attached to this letter. The following table summarizes the two (2) trip generation calculations and compares the differences between the previously planned land use and the new proposed land use.

Table 3: Trip Generation Comparison

TIME PERIOD	PREVIOUS	PROPOSED	COMPARISON
WEEKDAY			
Total	219	80	-139
AM PEAK HOUR			
Total	16	3	-13
Enter	4	2	-2
Exit	12	1	-11
PM PEAK HOUR			
Total	21	4	-17
Enter	13	2	-11
Exit	8	2	-6

Based on the trip generation calculations, the new proposed land uses are anticipated to generate 139 less daily trips, 13 less morning peak hour trips and 17 less evening peak hour trips than the previously planned land use. It is also important to note that the proposed 10 additional hotel guestroom structures will bring the total guestroom inventory to 195 guestrooms. This is less than the 201 total units approved by the Town of Paradise Valley in 2015.

ATTACHMENTS

Site Plan
Previous Report Excerpts
Trip Generation Output Sheets




Expires: 6/30/2023



ANdAZ | Resort Expansion

Conceptual Site Plan

05 April 2022



burton
Landscape Architecture Studio



Kimley-Horn
and Associates, Inc.

September 4, 2013

Mr. James Shano, P.E.
Public Works Director
Town of Paradise Valley
6401 E. McDonald Drive
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253



■
Suite 300
7740 N. 16th Street
Phoenix, Arizona
85020

**Re: Cottonwoods Resort - Paradise Valley, Arizona
Major Special Use Permit (SUP) Amendment
Traffic and Parking Impact Analysis – Revision No. 1**

Dear Mr. Shano:

This letter discusses the anticipated traffic and parking impacts of redevelopment plans for the Cottonwoods Resort. The redevelopment plans discussed in this letter are the subject of an application currently under consideration by the Town of Paradise Valley for a major amendment to the Cottonwoods Resort Special Use Permit (SUP). The Cottonwoods Resort is operating under an existing SUP that covers 22 acres of privately owned contiguous parcels (the main resort site) located south of Lincoln Drive; west of Scottsdale Road; north of McDonald Drive; and east of Quail Run Road.

Overview

The Cottonwoods application requests an increase in the SUP coverage area, from 22.5 acres to 27.5 acres; and an increase in the maximum allowable number of resort guest/residential units, from 172 units to 282 units. A vicinity map and project site breakdown is presented in attached **Exhibit A**. A conceptual site plan for the property is presented in attached **Exhibit B**. Also attached to this letter are five additional exhibits (**Exhibits C through G**) displaying traffic impact information in a graphic format; and three pages of tables (**Tables 1 through 13**) that summarize the quantitative information and opinions discussed below.

Executive Summary

The information provided with this letter demonstrates the following:

- Cottonwoods redevelopment will add fewer than 80 trips to Rose Lane during either peak hour. Rose Lane and the Scottsdale/Rose intersection have enough capacity remaining to accommodate all of this trip generation, as well as all of the traffic anticipated to



TEL 602 944 5500
FAX 602 944 7423




come from the recently approved “commercial to residential” land use conversion of the rear portion of the Borgata property, which is located adjacent to the Cottonwoods property.

- Daily traffic volumes on Rose Lane will be lower, after the Cottonwoods and Borgata sites have been redeveloped than it would have been if the Borgata site remained commercial.
- Peak hour level of service at the Scottsdale/Rose intersection is expected to remain in the acceptable level of service range after Cottonwoods is completely redeveloped, without any traffic impact mitigation on Rose Lane, and regardless of whether or not any access to the Cottonwoods is provided on Quail Run Road.
- Approval of the Cottonwoods application will add no traffic to Quail Run Road, except during emergencies, as required by the Town. In fact, the Cottonwoods redevelopment will actually reduce the potential future traffic volume on Quail Run Road, by relocating access for the 5-acre expansion parcel currently accessed from Quail Run Road, to Rose Lane.
- Even if Cottonwoods residential (and not resort) access was to be provided along Quail Run Road (a dual access scenario), the amount of Cottonwoods traffic that would use Quail Run would be minimal (approximately 104 vehicles per day, and fewer than 20 vehicles during either peak hour).
- The proposed redevelopment of the Cottonwoods property should not be the basis for determining when or how to close the existing “gap” in Quail Run Road because, regardless of which the above cited access scenarios is implemented, the amount of traffic this project would add to Quail Run Road would be minimal.
- The determination as to how and when to complete the rest of Quail Run Road between Lincoln and McDonald, should not occur without the following:
 - Specific consideration of the potential future use of the eight acres of undeveloped Sunchase property located to the west of the Cottonwoods site;
 - support of an alignment from existing owners of property along this segment of Quail Run Road; and
 - additional traffic impact analysis.
- The parking proposed for the Resort redevelopment is adequate.

Details of the Proposed Redevelopment

The Cottonwoods application currently under consideration by the Town of Paradise Valley proposes the following:

1. The Cottonwoods application proposes to redevelop the existing 22.5-acre SUP governed portion of the resort property, in a



Not to Scale

LEGEND

- SUP** Existing Cottonwoods Resort/SUP Area – 22.5 Acres
- SUPX** Proposed Cottonwoods SUP Expansion Parcel – 5.0 Acres
- CC** Cottonwoods Commercial Parcel – 2.7 Acres
(Not a part of this application)
- BR** Borgata Redevelopment Site - 5.2 Acres
(Not a part of this application)
- S8** Sunchase Property - 8.0 Acres
(Not a part of this application)
- Existing Signalized Intersection
- Recognized Future Signalized Intersection
- Stop Sign Controlled Intersection Approach

September 2013

Vicinity Map and Context Plan

Cottonwoods Resort Special Use Permit Amendment – Traffic Impact and Parking Analysis - Rev. 1

Exhibit
A



Not to Scale



	Building Type	Building Area	Overhang Area	Buildings / Floors	Units Per Building	Total Units	Total Building Area	Total Overhang Area	Total Coverage
Existing	B3	2438	512	4	5	20	9,752	2048	11,800
	B4	2687	688	5	5	25	13,435	3440	16,875
	B7	2675	720	7	5	35	18,715	5040	23,755
	B8	2924	820	4	5	20	17,544	4920	22,464
	B9	2954	804	6	5	30	17,604	4824	22,428
	B10	2354	576	1	5	5	2,354	576	2,930
	Bar	164	164	1				164	164
	Canopy		144					144	144
	Recreation	529		1			529		529
	Total Existing					145	79,939	21,356	101,295
New	Lobby/Mtg	8500		1			8,500		8,500
	Pool Ramada		324	3				972	972
	Pool Bldg	648		1			648		648
Total Phase 1							89,087	22,328	111,415

	Building Type	Building Area	Overhang Area	Buildings	Units Per Building	Total Units	Total Building Area	Total Overhang Area	Total Coverage
Phase 2	C1	3090		15	1	15	45,000		45,000
	C2	2400		32	1	32	76,800		76,800
Total Phase 2							121,800		121,800

	Building Type	Building Area	Overhang Area	Floors	Units Per Floor	Total Units	Total Building Area	Total Overhang Area	Total Coverage
Phase 3	D1	14,300		3	15	45	42,900		14,300
	D2	14,300		3	15	45	42,900		14,300
Total Phase 3							85,800		28,600

Total Coverage									211,815
Total Floor Area							236,607		
Total Units						282			
Remaining Allowable Floor Area							9,743		

Phase 1 Lot Area	708,149 Sq Ft
Phase 2 Lot Area	413,172 Sq Ft
TOTAL LOT	1,301,321 Sq Ft
Total Allowable Coverage (0.25 x Lot Area)	300,130 Sq Ft
Existing Coverage	101,295 Sq Ft
Additional Allowable Coverage	198,835 Sq Ft

Current Coverage of Parcel	15%
Current FAR of Parcel	12%
Phase 2 Total Coverage	233,215 Sq Ft
Phase 2 Coverage Ratio	18%
Phase 2 Total Floor Area	210,687 Sq Ft
Phase 2 FAR	18%

Phase 3 Total Coverage	281,815
Phase 3 Coverage Ratio	22%
Phase 3 Total Floor Area	236,687
Phase 3 FAR	25%



SCS ADVISORS, INC

The Cottonwoods Resort
Paradise Valley, AZ

17 April 2013

Conceptual Site Plan

NelsenPartners
www.nelsenpartners.com

September 2013

Conceptual Site Plan

Cottonwoods Resort Special Use Permit Amendment – Traffic and Parking Impact Analysis - Rev. 1

Exhibit
B

Trip Generation Comparison of Alternative SUP Amendment Scenarios

Tables 1 thru 3

Table 1 - Cottonwoods Trip Generation as currently proposed (the "With SUP Amendment" Scenario)

Land Use	ITE Land Use Code	Quantity	Units	Trips Generated ⁽¹⁾						
				Daily Total	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
					In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Cottonwoods Resort Residential (Inclusive of 5 Acre Expansion Parcel)	210	47	Dwelling Units	448	9	26	35	30	17	47
Cottonwoods Resort Hotel/Casita	330	235	Guest Units	1,920 ⁽²⁾	53	20	73	43	56	99
Totals		282		2,368	62	46	108	73	73	146

Table 2 - Trip Generation as already allowed (the "Without SUP Amendment" Scenario)

Land Use	ITE Land Use Code	Quantity	Units	Trips Generated ⁽¹⁾						
				Daily Total	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
					In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Cottonwoods Resort Residential (Exclusive of 5-Acre Expansion Parcel)	210	1	Dwelling Units	10	0	1	1	1	0	1
Cottonwoods Resort Casita	330	171	Guest Units	1,398 ⁽²⁾	38	15	53	31	41	72
Totals		172		1,408	38	16	54	32	41	73

Trip Generation Source - Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 9th Edition

⁽¹⁾ No daily estimate available for Resort Hotel. Daily Hotel rate (ITE land use code 310) used to estimate daily trips.

Table 3 - Cottonwoods SUP Amendment Trip Generation Impact Summary

Trip Generation Increase/(Reduction) Resulting from SUP Amendment Approval	Daily	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
	960 Trips	54 Trips	73 Trips

Notes:

- 1) Trip Generation Source - Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation, 9th Edition
- 2) No daily estimate available for Resort Hotel. Daily Hotel rate (ITE land use code 310) used to estimate daily trips.

Hotel (310)


Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Rooms
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 7
Avg. Num. of Rooms: 148
Directional Distribution: 50% entering, 50% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Room

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
7.99	5.31 - 9.53	1.92

Data Plot and Equation




Resort Hotel (330)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Rooms
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
 Number of Studies: 6
 Avg. Num. of Rooms: 524
 Directional Distribution: 72% entering, 28% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Room

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
0.32	0.24 - 0.41	0.08

Data Plot and Equation




Resort Hotel (330)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Rooms
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
 Number of Studies: 9
 Avg. Num. of Rooms: 507
 Directional Distribution: 43% entering, 57% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Room

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
0.41	0.19 - 0.51	0.08

Data Plot and Equation



Single-Family Detached Housing

(210)


Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 174
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 246
Directional Distribution: 50% entering, 50% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
9.43	4.45 - 22.61	2.13

Data Plot and Equation



Single-Family Detached Housing

(210)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs:

Dwelling Units

On a:

Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.

Setting/Location:

General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies:

192

Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units:

226


Directional Distribution:

26% entering, 74% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
0.70	0.27 - 2.27	0.24

Data Plot and Equation



Single-Family Detached Housing

(210)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units

On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.

Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban

Number of Studies: 208

Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 248

Directional Distribution: 63% entering, 37% exiting

Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

Average Rate	Range of Rates	Standard Deviation
0.94	0.35 - 2.98	0.31

Data Plot and Equation

