

**Correspondence Between
Staff and Applicant
Approval Letter**

September 2, 2014

Adam Yaron/Jesus Murillo
7447 E. Indian School Rd.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

RE: 12-ZN-2014 and 4-GP-2014
Cavalliere Flat

Dear Adam and Jesus:

We have completed the response to the 1st review of the above referenced development application submitted on 6-11-2014. The following letter represents the responses to the review performed by the City, and is intended to provide you with our proposal for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application.

Major General Plan Amendment (4-GP-2014)

Major General Plan Analysis:

1. The Project Narrative provided with the first submittal does not address the criterion associated with the Administration Section of the 2001 General Plan. With the next submittal, please respond clearly identifying all four criteria utilized in evaluating an amendment.

Criterion: 1.Change in land use category, 2.Area/Acreage of change Criteria, 3.Character Area Criteria, 4. Water/Wastewater infrastructure Criteria.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, THE RESPONSES TO THE ABOVE CRITERION HAS BEEN ADDED.

1.1 Respond to criterion #4, and address whether the proposal to change the planned land use category results in a premature increase in the size of the master planned water transmission or sewer collection facility – this criterion would also qualify the proposal as a major amendment..

Criterion 4.Water/wastewater infrastructure Criteria

RESPONSE: WATER RESOURCES STAFF HAS INDICATED THAT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND CHANGE TO THE PLANNED LAND USE CATEGORY DOES NOT RESULT IN ANY INCREASES TO THE MASTER WATER TRANSMISSION OR SEWER COLLECTION FACILITY. SUFFICIENT CAPACITY EXISTS WITH BOTH THE WATER AND WASTEWATER FACILITIES TO SERVE THE PROPOSED PROJECT WITHOUT ANY IMPROVEMENTS OR INCREASES TO THE EXISTING FACILITIES.

2.Unless the proposals of 4-GP-2014 and 5-GP-2014 are to be contingent upon an action of the other, please remove any reference to 5-GP-2014 in the narrative of 4-GP-2014. The merits of each case are to be considered separately and it would be best for the general public to understand that as your proposal currently represents – the existing non-residential use (commercial) in 4-GP-2014 – is proposed to be replaced by a residential neighborhood

4-GP-2014
9/2/2014

(suburban neighborhoods).

RESPONSE: CASES 4 & 5 GP-2014 ARE NOT CONTINGENT UPON THE ACTION OF THE OTHER. ALTHOUGH THE FAMILIES DECISION TO RELOCATE GREASEWOOD FLAT (5-GP-2014) IS RELEVANT TO THE PROPOSAL OF THIS CASE.

3. To better serve the community openly and transparently, please identify each Goal and Approaches citation in its entirety next to each response provided. Please number goals and approaches so they are easily identifiable.

RESPONSE: PER A CONVERSATION WITH STAFF, THE ABOVE REQUEST HAS BEEN ADDRESSED FOR THOSE GOALS AND APPROACHES THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THIS CASE.

4. Please expand upon the discussion relating to Goal #1 of the Character and Design Element – please consider the approaches that identify specific considerations specifically bullets 1 through 4. Also consider the approaches listed on Page 106 of the 2001 General Plan specifically Goal #4, bullet item #1 which identifies Character Areas. Please note that this property is adjacent to the Dynamite Foothills Character Area, and as such, considerations to sensitive edges and transitions need to be responded to.

Goal 1. Determine the appropriateness of all development in terms of community goals, surrounding area character, and the specific context of the surrounding neighborhood.

Goal 4. Preserve and enhance the unique sense of neighborhood found in diverse areas of Scottsdale through neighborhood conservation.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, MORE DETAILED RESPONSES HAVE BEEN PROVIDED FOR THE GOALS AND ASSOCIATED BULLETS LISTED ABOVE.

5. Please update the narrative to respond to the Character and Design Element Goal #2, bullets 2, 5, and 6.

Goal 2. Review the design of all development proposals to foster quality design that enhances Scottsdale as a unique southwestern desert community. (The City Charter excludes review of detached single family residential)

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, BULLETS 2, 5 & 6 OF THE ABOVE GOAL 2 HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED.

6. Please update the narrative to expand on the discussion of Goal #3 in the Character and Design Element as it relates to the proposal submitted. The response provided discusses a different application (5-GP-2014).

Goal 3. Identify Scottsdale's historic, archaeological and cultural resources, promote an awareness of them for future generations, and support their preservation and conservation.

RESPONSE: WHILE IT IS OUR INTENT TO PRESERVE ELEMENTS OF THE SITES HISTORY THROUGH PRESERVATION OF MATERIALS WE HAVE ELIMINATED, PER YOUR REQUEST, THE RESPONSE SUMMARY WHERE WE TALK ABOUT THE GHOST OF GREASEWOOD...RECOGNIZING IT IN DESIGN ELEMENTS. THE GOAL IS REALLY NOT APPLICABLE.

7. Upon resubmittal, please describe the provided setbacks along N. Alma School Parkway, East Jomax Road, and East Pinnacle Vista Drive that would be consistent with the City's Desert Scenic Roadway policy and revise Goal 4 on Page 7 of this first submittal to recognize the Desert Scenic Roadway policies/requirements. Case 1-GP-2004, identified Scenic Roadways Designations as part of the 2001 General Plan; specifically a third level of "Desert Scenic Roadways" was incorporated. Desert Scenic Roadways are the one-mile and half mile roads within the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Overlay district that are not already designated as a Scenic Corridor or Buffered Roadway. For reference, see the following link: <https://eservices.scottsdaleaz.gov/eServices/cases/casesheet.aspx?caseid=26962> All frontages will need to be both narratively and graphically shown with the resubmittal.

RESPONSE: ONE OF THE THREE APPROVED DESERT SCENIC ROADWAY CRITERION IS THAT ESLO PRIORITIES (E.G. WASH PRESERVATION AND CONTIGIOUS OPEN SPACE) FOR NAOS BE MET PRIOR TO THE LOCATION OF THE OPEN SPACE ALONG THE ROAD. WITH THE ACTUAL DIMINSION OF THE CORRIDOR SUBJECT TO ESLO PRIORITIES, CAVALLIERE FLATS PROVIDES VARYING CORRIDOR WIDTHS BASED ON TOPOGRAPHY AND NATURAL SITE CONDITIONS.

WITH THE ALMA SCHOOL PARKWAY CORRIDOR, THE PRIORITY HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE MAJOR WASH WHICH BISECTS THE SITE. IN ORDER TO BE SENSITIVE TO THE NATURAL TERRAIN ASSOCIATED WITH THIS WASH, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SLOPES UP TO THE EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS OF ALMA SCHOOL ROAD, A MINIMUM +/-30' TO 45' DESERT SCENIC CORRIDOR IS BEING PROPOSED. THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVED RESIDENTIAL PROJECT TO THE NORTH (QUISANA) ALONG WITH CASE 1-GP-2004 WHICH STATES THAT:

"THE DESERT SCENIC ROADWAY WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED PRIMARILY THROUGH NAOS LOCATION AND ZONING SETBACK APPLICATION. THE SETBACK WILL VARY BASED ON SITE CONDITIONS, PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENT, AND TOPOGRAPHY OF THE PARCEL...ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS"

CURRENTLY ALMA SCHOOL HAS NO DESERT SCENIC CORRIDOR AS DEVELOPMENT IS ADJACENT TO THE ROADWAY. THIS PROPOSAL WILL CONNECT THE ADJACENT CORRIDORS TO THE NORTH AND SOUTH CREATING AN ONGOING DESERT SCENIC BUFFER ALONG THE PROPERTIES WEST FRONTAGE.

FACTORING IN THE ESLO PRIORTIES TO THE EAST, THE PROPOSED MINIMUM JOMAX DESERT SCENIC CORRIDOR OF +/-33' ALLOWS FOR PRESERVATION OF A NATURAL WASH BETWEEN LOTS 68 & 69. THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENT

TO THE EAST. WITH NO FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS PLANNED FOR JOMAX THE PROPOSED NATURAL DESERT CORRIDOR ADJACENT TO OUR DEVELOPMENT IS +/-83' FROM THE EXISTING EDGE OF PAVEMENT.

PINNACLE VISTA DRIVE IS A LOCAL DRIVE THAT SERVES 9 EXISTING HOMES TO THE EAST OF THE SITE. WITH NO DIRECT ACCESS FROM OUR SITE ALONG WITH SEGMENTED OWNERSHIP ALONG THE FRONTAGE THE PROPOSED DESERT SCENIC CORRIDOR WILL VARY FROM 30' UP TO 100'. THESE VARIED SETBACKS ARE WELL ABOVE THE ADAJACT RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT TO THE NORTH, WHICH HAS BUFFERS RANGING AS SMALL AS 0'-10', CONSISTENT WITH "PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENT" AS STATED IN 1-GP-2004

8. Please update the narrative to respond to Goal #6 of the Character and Design Element.

Goal 6. Recognize the value and visual significance that landscaping has upon the character of the community and maintain standards that result in substantial, mature landscaping that reinforces the character of the city.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, A RESPONSE HAS BEEN ADDED TO ADDRESS GOAL 6 OF THE CHARACTER AND DESIGN ELEMENT.

9. With the next submittal, please submit a revised narrative responding to the Land Use Element of the 2001 General Plan. It appears significant goals and approaches should be addressed: #1, #2, #3, #4 and #6 as it relates to 4-GP-2014 and not 5-GP-2014.

RESPONSE: THESE ARE CITYWIDE GOALS, BUT WE ADDED NOTES THAT SUGGEST HOW THIS PROPOSAL CAN CONTRIBUTE TOWARD MEETING THEM. WITH REGARD TO: THE CONCERN ABOUT 4-GP-2014 AND 5-GP-2015. WE MENTION GREASEWOOD IN A FEW PLACES, WHERE RELEVANT, AS PART OF THE HISTORY OF THE PROPERTY, BUT WE DON'T IMPLY THAT THEY ARE CONTINGENT UPON THE ACTION OF THE OTHER.

10. Please update the narrative to provide a numerical comparison of trips counts for the proposed use (residential) to the existing commercial operation of Greasewood Flats and Reatta Pass in the response to Goal #5 as part of the Land Use Element.

RESPONSE: TRIP COMPARISON MEMO PROVIDED FOR LVA TO ADD TO INFORMATION TO NARRATIVE. MEMO PROVIDES NUMERICAL COMPARISONS.

11. With the next submittal, please provide a revised Project Narrative expanding on the discussion for the cited Land Use Goals & Approaches #7, identifying what areas of open space will be provided with the proposed amendment. Consider providing the NAOS calculations showing what is required and what is being provided based on ESLO standards and how this proposal furthers the requirement of base minimum standards.

Goal 7. Sensitively integrate land uses into the surrounding physical and natural environments, the neighborhood setting, and the neighborhood itself.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, GOAL 7 HAS BEEN ADDRESSED ON PAGES 17-18 OF THE REVISED NARRATIVE.

12. Please update the narrative to expand on the discussion of Goal #8 as part of the Land Use Element. Consider approaches #2 and #3.

Goal 8. Encourage land uses that create a sense of community among those who work, live, and play within local neighborhoods.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, GOAL 8 HAS BEEN ADDRESSED ON PAGES 19-20 OF THE REVISED NARRATIVE.

13. Since the discussion about the conversion of commercial land to other uses in the northern parts of Scottsdale has increased, with the next submittal, please provide a market study that supports the statement made as part of the Economic Vitality portion of the first submittal.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST A SECTION HAS BEEN ADDED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE ECONOMIC VITALITY ELEMENT, ON PAGE 20, DISCUSSING THIS ISSUE.

14. Please submit an updated copy of the Neighborhood Involvement/ Citizen Input Report with the next submittal.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST THE UPDATED REPORT HAS BEEN INCLUDED.

15. Please update narrative to expand upon the discussion relating to Goals and Approaches #2 as part of the Housing Element and provide some insight into the architectural style, landscape and residential building scale the proposed development brings to the context area.

Goal 2. Seek a variety of housing options that blend with the character of the surrounding community.

RESPONSE: THE REQUESTED LANGUAGE ADDRESSING GOAL 2 OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT HAS BEEN PROVIDED ON PAGE 23 OF THE REVISED NARRATIVE.

16. With the next submittal, please provide a revised Project Narrative responding to the Neighborhood Element, Goals and Approaches #5. Please provide some perspective as to why this proposal would better align itself with this Goal and Approach than the current non-residential use.

Goal 5. Promote and encourage context-appropriate new development in established areas of the community.

RESPONSE: THE REQUESTED LANGUAGE ADDRESSING GOAL 5 OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD ELEMENT HAS BEEN PROVIDED ON PAGE 25 OF THE REVISED NARRATIVE.

17. With the next submittal, please provide a revised Project Narrative responding to the Open Space and Recreation Element, Goals and Approaches #1. Please expand on the discussion of what this proposal is providing in terms of buffering adjacent to the subject property's neighbors and roadways. Please discuss the method of application in providing these open spaces. Furthermore, please identify how access to these spaces will be provided and identify if these spaces are to be publicly or privately accessed. Consider the provisions of Desert Scenic Roadways in the response.

Goal 1. Protect and improve the quality of Scottsdale's natural and urban environments as defined in the quality and quantity of its open spaces.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, THE ABOVE MENTIONED GOAL HAS BEEN ADDRESSED ON PAGE 26 OF THE REVISED NARRATIVE.

18. With the next submittal, please provide a revised Project Narrative expanding the discussion regarding the Preservation and Environmental Planning Element, Goals and Approaches #2, #3, and #9. Please discuss the site planning methods and site orientation of the companion zoning proposal in the context of the proposed land use.

Goal 2. Enhance the quality of life in Scottsdale by safeguarding the natural environment.

Goal 3. Achieve a sustainable balance between the conservation, use and development of Scottsdale's natural resources.

Goal 9. Protect and conserve native plants as a significant natural and visual resource.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, THE ABOVE MENTIONED GOALS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED ON PAGES 28-29 OF THE REVISED NARRATIVE.

19. With the next submittal, please submit a revised Project Narrative responding to the Public Services and Facilities Element, Goals and Approaches #2 and #10 discussing flood mitigation and open space connections that are accessible to residents of the proposed community and the public alike.

Goal 2. Protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public from the impacts of flooding.

Goal 10. Provide recreational opportunities to meet the needs of all areas of the community through public facilities.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, LANGUAGE ADDRESSING GOAL 2 (ABOVE) HAS BEEN ADDED ON PAGE 30 OF THE REVISED NARRATIVE. GOAL 10 DOESN'T REALLY APPLY BECAUSE IT ADDRESSES PUBLIC PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES.

20. Please update narrative to identify the Goals and Approaches numbers that are in response to the Public Services and Facilities Element provided with the first submittal.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, LANGUAGE ADDED ON PAGES 32-33 - MOST OF THESE APPROACHES ARE NOT DIRECTLY RELEVANT.

21. Please update narrative to identify the Goals and Approaches numbers that are in response to the Community Mobility Element provided with the 1st submittal. Furthermore, please respond in more specificity the connections that this proposal will physically make to adjacent multi-modal corridors.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, LANGUAGE ADDED ON PAGES 34-36. MOST ARE NOT APPLICABLE.

22. With the next submittal, please submit a revised Project Narrative responding to the Community Mobility Element, Goals and Approaches #7, #8, #9, #10, and #11.

RESPONSE: PER YOUR REQUEST, LANGUAGE ADDED ON PAGES 34-36. MOST ARE NOT APPLICABLE.

23. As mentioned earlier, please note that the subject property abuts an adopted character area, The Dynamite Foothills Character Area. Please qualify how this proposal will transition to the goals and policies of this adopted character area plan. This plan can be located at: <http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/Public+Website/Planning/Plan.pdf>

RESPONSE: GENERAL LANGUAGE ADDED ON PAGE 5. IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS ELEMENT, ALTHOUGH CAVALLIERE FLATS IS NOT WITHIN THE DYNAMITE FOOTHILLS CHARACTER AREA, IT IS LOCATED NEAR ITS WEST BOUNDARY. CAVALLIERE FLATS REPRESENTS LESS INTENSE USES THAN THOSE PREVIOUSLY ON THE PROPERTY AND ESTABLISHES A TRANSITION FROM HIGHER INTENSITY USES ALONG ALMA SCHOOL ROAD AND LOWER INTENSITY USES WITHIN THE DYNAMITE FOOTHILLS CHARACTER AREA. MANY OF THE GUIDELINES SPECIFIED IN THE CHARACTER AREA PLAN (CAP) WERE FOLLOWED IN PLANNING FOR CAVALLIERE FLATS (HOMES CLUSTERED TO ALLOW VIEWS, PRESERVATION OF NAOS FEATURES)

24. Land Use Element Graphics: It appears that there are a number of inconsistencies in the graphics for the existing and proposed land use designation exhibits that were provided in the first submittal. The graphics of Figure 3 and Figure 4 (Page2) Section B, does not accurately represent the narrative discussion that accompanies the graphics. Upon resubmittal please ensure that the graphics submitted accurately represent the intentions of the applicant and current landowners alike.

RESPONSE: THE ABOVE ACREAGE DISCREPANCIES HAVE BEEN REVISED, ACCURATELY REPRESENTING BOTH THE FIGURE, TEXT AND INTENT.

25. Title and Ownership Verification:

RESPONSE: THE PROJECT BOUNDARY AND TITLE COMMITMENT IS ACCURATE AS SHOWN ON THE GRAPHICS AND DISCUSSED IN THE NARRATIVE.

25.1 Please note that staff has received phone calls from one of the underlying property owners (George Cavalliere) requesting a change in the project boundary of approximately +1.7 acres. This request did not communicate a specific assessor parcel number to verify the request in this 1st review comment letter. Nevertheless, if there is to be a change in the project's boundary – please verify the property owner's commitment to the request and the project boundary prior to resubmittal. Any changes to the project boundary will require that additional changes be made to the narrative, graphics, and any supporting documentation.

25.2 The City requires applicants for various general plan amendments, zoning applications, building permits and other approvals to provide evidence of land ownership. The documents provided with the 1st submittal are insufficient. Please see the Requirements for Submitting Evidence of Title which can be found at:

<http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/Public+Website/bldgresources/TitleEvidence.pdf> Once revisions to the request document have been made, please note that:

- A. The city reserves the right to require additional evidence of title, including but not limited to an extended title insurance policy in favor of the city, and that.
 - B. The applicant shall provide in writing of any and all title changes that occur after the title commitment is issued.
26. With the resubmittal provide an info-graphic that clearly identifies all ownership interests within the development boundary. Noting the requirements mentioned above, please update and /or verify the following documents for the case file.

- . 26.1 The Development Application.
- . 26.2 Title Insurance Commitment for Proof of Title, and
- . 26.3 The Affidavit of Authority to Act for Property Owner.

RESPONSE: THE PROJECT BOUNDARY HAS BEEN CONFIRMED TO BE CORRECT. AN INFO GRAPHIC HAS BEEN PROVIDED TO CLEARLY IDENTIFY ALL OWNERSHIP INTERESTS WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY ALONG WITH THE ABOVE UPDATED DOCUMENTS.

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. Please address the following:

Zoning:

- 27. Please submit a revised Project Narrative for the zoning submittal that includes an explanation on how the proposed zoning map amendment is consistent with the goals and objectives set forth by the 2001 General Plan. Furthermore, note that this property

is adjacent to the Dynamite Foothills Character Area boundary. As such, considerations to sensitive edges and transitions need to be responded to. The discussion provided should remark upon all points of analysis to both the existing, and proposed, land use designations of the project site; consistent with the associated major General Plan amendment submittal, submitted under case 4-GP-2014.

RESPONSE: NARRATIVE UPDATED TO REFLECT REQUEST.

28. The provided narrative states that approximately 14.65+/- acres of the subject site as being required as Natural Area Open Space; and the narrative states that 15.0 acres of Natural Area Open Space will be dedicated with the future associated preliminary plat application. Provide justification for the increase in density by means of additional Natural Area Open Space, or by other means of improvement.

RESPONSE: THE SITE IS REQUIRED TO PROVIDE 14.65 ACRES OF NAOS, 31% OF THE GROSS ACREAGE. WHILE CAVALLIERE FLATS IS PROPOSING TO PROVIDE 19.05 ACRES WHICH IS OVER 40% OF THE SITE. THIS 30% INCREASE OF NAOS CREATES A SENSITIVE DESIGN APPROACH CONSISTENT WITH THE ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDS ORDINANCE.

WHEN COMPARING THE PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY WITH EXISTING ALLOWED COMMERCIAL USES, THE OVERALL INTENSITY OF USES AND THE TRAFFIC THEY GENERATE WILL BE REDUCED. IN ADDITION TO ROADWAY, INFRASTRUCTURE AND DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, CAVALLIERE FLATS WILL CREATE A TRANSITION IN LAND USE INTENSITY BETWEEN THE ACTIVITY CENTER DESIGNATED WEST OF ALMA SCHOOL PARKWAY AND THE RURAL PROPERTIES ADJOINING THE SITE TO THE EAST. IT WILL NOT ONLY COMPLEMENT AND ENHANCE THE CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA, BUT WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THE UNIQUE, BEAUTIFUL IDENTITY OF SCOTTSDALE, ITS HIGH STANDARD QUALITIES AND ITS REMARKABLY COVETED LIFESTYLE.

29. Please update the provided narrative to address the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance regulations (A-L on pages 8 and 9 of the narrative). The provided narrative identified the regulations, but does not address how the proposed project will incorporate them into the site plan.

RESPONSE: RATHER THAN LIST OUR PROPOSED REGULATIONS THAT ARE MET THROUGH THIS PROPOSAL, THIS SECTION HAS BEEN REFORMATED TO RESPOND TO THE ESL REGULATIONS.

30. The provided narrative describes the amended development standards that will be proposed if the Major General Plan amendment and the request to amend the Zoning Map are approved. The proposed amended development standards included in the narrative request amending the standards to a percentage larger than allowed by Ordinance Section 6.1083. Also provide justification for requested amended

development standards.

RESPONSE: AS COMMON PRACTICE THESE PROPOSED STANDARDS HAVE BEEN ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST FOOT IN ORDER TO EASE THE NECESSARY FIELD VERIFICATION. IT IS THE INTENT TO MODIFY THE STANDARDS BY 25% AS ALLOWED BY THE ESLO.

31. Please update the site plan (subdivision plat) to provide a table showing all proposed lot net lot areas.

RESPONSE: LOT AREA TABLE ADDED TO SUBDIVISION PLAN.

Legal:

32. Please submit the original documents for all applicants/owners as follows: Rezoning Applications, Letter of Authorization to Act for Property Owner, Affidavit of Authorization to Act for Property Owner, Appeal of Required Dedications or Exactions, and the Request for Site Visits and/or Inspections Form.

RESPONSE: THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN INCLUDED.

Archeological:

33. Please submit an updated Archeological Report that encompasses the entire subject site. Staff will reserve comments to the time of a completed archeological survey.

RESPONSE: COMPLETED

Circulation:

34. Owner/Applicant will likely need to dedicate 45 feet of right-of-way, on N. Alma School Road, along adjacent frontages of the subject site. The northern portion of the site includes dedicating both sides of the street, to a Rural/ESL, Major Collector roadway standard (Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-36; DSPM Sec. 5-3.100).

RESPONSE: NOTED. PROPOSED ROW DEDICATION ALONG FRONTAGE SHOWN IN SUBDIVISION PLAN.

35. Owner/Applicant will likely need to dedicate 35 feet of right-of-way, on E. Pinnacle Vista Drive, along adjacent frontages of the subject site (existing 25 feet) to a Rural/ESL Local Collector, with Trail roadway standard (Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-36; DSPM Sec. 5-3.100).

RESPONSE: THE PROPOSAL IS TO KEEP THE EXISTING 25' DEDICATION IN PLACE. THIS IS DUE TO SEGMENTED OWNERSHIP ALONG THE PINNACLE VISTA FRONTAGE, WHICH INCLUDES OWNERS OF EXISTING DEVELOPED LOTS NOT A PART OF THIS CASE. ALSO NO PROPOSED DIRECT ACCESS OR IMPACTS ARE PLAN FROM THE SITE ONTO THIS

EXISTING DRIVE. IF A TRAIL IS DESIRED, AND CAN BE COORDINATED WITH THE EFFECTED OWNERS, AN EASEMENT WOULD BE CONSIDERED.

36. Owner/Applicant will likely need to complete the full Rural/ESL Major Collector cross section along the site frontage, matching the existing pavement cross section to the north. Construct 8 foot wide sidewalks along both sides of the street, separated from the back of curb where feasible. Provide an appropriate pavement transition to the existing street cross section to the south of the site beginning the transition at the southern property line (Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-36; DSPM Figure 5.3-8).

RESPONSE: ONLY A SMALL PORTION OF THE PROPERTY EXISTS ON THE WEST SIDE OF ALMA SCHOOL. CURRENTLY, NO SIDEWALK CONNECTION EXISTS NORTH OR SOUTH OF THE PROPERTY FRONTAGE. ADDITIONAL PAVEMENT ON THE WEST SIDE WOULD NOT EXTEND THE PAVEMENT OR ALLOW FOR AN ADDITIONAL SOUTHBOUND TRAVEL LANE ALONG OUR FRONTAGE DUE TO THE LIMITED FRONTAGE OWNED ALONG THE WEST SIDE OF ALMA SCHOOL. IT IS PROPOSED THAT THE ULTIMATE CURB AND PAVEMENT WIDTHS AND SIDEWALK BE PROVIDED ALONG THE EAST FRONTAGE OF ALMA SCHOOL.

37. Owner/Applicant will likely need to dedicate 46 feet of right-of-way, or tract, for the internal streets for a Suburban Local, Residential Street, roadway standard (Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-36; DSPM Sec. 5-3-20).

RESPONSE: THE PROPOSED CROSS-SECTION FOR THE PRIVATE STREETS WITHIN THIS GATED COMMUNITY IS THE 40' RURAL "AND/OR" ESL ROADWAY STANDARD. THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH NORTH SCOTTSDALE, ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDS, THE ADJACENT AND SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS WITH COMPARABLE (EVEN HIGHER IN A LOT OF CASES) DENSITIES AND THE ADJACENT CHARACTER AREA. THIS STANDARD PROVIDES FOR ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE, LIMITS CUTS/FILL IN HIGHER SLOPE AREAS AS ENCOURAGE BY ESLO AND PROVIDES A MORE RURAL CHARACTER AS PROMOTED BY THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE ADJACENT CHARACTER AREA.

38. Owner/Applicant will likely need to construct the internal streets to the Suburban Local, Residential Street, roadway standard (Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-36; DSPM Figure 5.3- 20).

RESPONSE: THE PROPOSED CROSS-SECTION FOR THE PRIVATE STREETS WITHIN THIS GATED COMMUNITY IS THE 40' RURAL "AND/OR" ESL ROADWAY STANDARD. THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH NORTH SCOTTSDALE, ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDS, THE ADJACENT QUISANA DEVELOPMENT AND SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS WITH COMPARABLE (EVEN HIGHER IN A LOT OF CASES) DENSITIES AND THE ADJACENT CHARACTER AREA. THIS STANDARD PROVIDES FOR ADDITIONAL OPEN SPACE, LIMITS CUTS/FILL IN HIGHER SLOPE AREAS AS ENCOURAGED BY ESLO AND PROVIDES A MORE RURAL CHARACTER AS PROMOTED BY THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE ADJACENT CHARACTER AREA.

39. North Alma School Road is considered a desert view corridor, and requires a minimum 50-foot desert landscape setback. Update narrative and site plan (preliminary plat) to provide a minimum 50-foot average setback (SCDG Chapter 5, paragraph b).

RESPONSE: ONE OF THE THREE APPROVED DESERT SCENIC ROADWAY CRITERION IS THAT ESLO PRIORITIES (E.G. WASH PRESERVATION AND CONTIGIOUS OPEN SPACE) FOR NAOS BE MET PRIOR TO THE LOCATION OF THE OPEN SPACE ALONG THE ROAD. WITH THIS PROPOSAL THE PRIORITY HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE MAJOR WASH, WHICH BISECTS THE SITE. IN ORDER TO BE SENSITIVE TO THE NATURAL TERRAIN ASSOCIATED WITH THIS WASH, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SLOPES UP TO THE EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS OF ALMA SCHOOL ROAD, A MINIMUM 30' TO 50' DESERT SCENIC CORRIDOR IS BEING PROPOSED. THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH THE APPROVED RESIDENTIAL PROJECT TO THE NORTH (QUISANA) ALONG WITH CASE 1-GP-2004 WHICH STATES THAT

"THE DESERT SCENIC ROADWAY WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED PRIMARILY THROUGH NAOS LOCATION AND ZONING SETBACK APPLICATION. THE SETBACK WILL VARY BASED ON SITE CONDITIONS, PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENT, AND TOPOGRAPHY OF THE PARCEL."

Fire:

40. Update the narrative, or provide a note on proposed site plan stating, "Key switch/pre-emption sensor" required for commercial/R-2 gates (Fire Ord. 4045, 503.6.1).

RESPONSE: NOTE PROVIDED ON SUBDIVISION PLAN AND SITE PLAN.

41. Update the narrative and conceptual site plan (preliminary plat) to demonstrate "Key switch/pre-emption sensor" required for gates (Fire Ord. 4045, 503.6.1).

RESPONSE: NOTE PROVIDED ON SUBDIVISION PLAN AND SITE PLAN.

42. Update the narrative and conceptual site plan (preliminary plat) to demonstrate minimum street width of 24' (Ord. 4045, 503.2.1).

RESPONSE: NOTE PROVIDED ON SUBDIVISION PLAN AND SITE PLAN.

Drainage:

43. Please submit two (2) copies of the revised Drainage Report with the original red-lined copy of the report with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A.

RESPONSE: COPIES AND REDLINES PROVIDED.

44. Please submit one (1) copy of the revised Storm Water Waiver with the original red-lined copy of the waiver with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A.

RESPONSE: STORMWATER WAIVER PROVIDED.

45. The content and analysis requirements for case drainage reports in support of 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 applications due to the preliminary nature of these applications. Case drainage reports submitted in support of general plan amendments and zoning applications should include a 50% level of design and analysis 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 90% level of design and analysis to allow an in-depth evaluation of the proposed project and the associated stormwater management system by City staff. If this project progresses to the development review or preliminary plat level, the case drainage report will need to be updated to meet the 90% requirement. Due to quick turnaround for zoning applications, it is likely the resubmittal of this drainage report will not occur prior to determination of the case. In this case our review comments will need to be addressed in the more detailed case drainage report in support of a development review or preliminary plat application.

RESPONSE: IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT MORE DETAIL WILL BE REQUIRED FOR THE PRELIMINARY PLAT APPLICATIONS. AS MENTIONED IN COMMENT 3, THE STORAGE REQUIREMENT FOR PRE VERSES POST WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE REPORT INCLUDED WITH PRELIMINARY PLAT. DISCUSSION WITH CITY STAFF ON THE OFFSITE FLOWS THAT IMPACT THE SITE FROM THE NORTH IS ONGOING AND WILL BE ADDRESSED FURTHER AT THE PRELIMINARY PLAT AS WELL.

46. Figures 3 and 4 will need to be revised to allow an evaluation of the project and the design and function of the proposed stormwater management system in general. The off-site watershed information should be provided in a separate figure that includes existing topography in addition to watershed boundaries and identifiers so the watershed boundaries may be reviewed. The watersheds affecting the western boundary of the site should be included in the off-site watershed exhibit. The existing and developed conditions on-site figures should be scaled to include the project and adjacent areas only. The existing condition on-site figure should show existing contours, existing streets, existing culverts with size, existing property lines, 100-year flow rates at points of entry, exit and confluence, existing 100-year floodplain limits, HEC-RAS sections, existing sub basin identifiers and boundaries, and flow paths for washes. The proposed condition figures should show, as a minimum, existing contours, existing and proposed streets, existing and proposed lots and property lines, 100-year flow rates at points of entry, exit and confluence, the general location of stormwater storage basins, proposed 100-year floodplain limits, HEC-RAS sections, proposed sub basin identifiers and boundaries, the location and conceptual design of stormwater conveyance improvements and culverts, and flow paths for washes. The proposed condition figure will be of primary use in evaluating the function and design of the proposed stormwater management system.

RESPONSE: AN OFFSITE DRAINAGE EXHIBIT HAS BEEN PROVIDED AS FIGURE 2. EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDENDUM TO THE PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE REPORT FOR THE ROCKS AT REATA PASS HAVE BEEN INCLUDED IN THE REPORT TO HELP VALIDATE THE OFFSITE FLOWS FROM THE WEST. FIGURES 3 AND 4 HAVE BEEN REVISED TO SHOW ALL REQUIRED ITEMS.

47. The report discusses the use of a number of on-site stormwater storage basins sized to contain the runoff volume associated with the first flush. The preliminary drainage report for the preliminary plat for this project will need to include a pre versus post development analysis showing no increase in runoff from the development which will reflect the design and sizing of the aforementioned stormwater storage basins. The City's stormwater storage waiver policy is contained in section 4.1-603 of the City's Design Standards and Procedures Manual. The policy should be reviewed for requirements for waivers. In general, the project will need to obtain a waiver for any volume less than the 100-year, 2-hour volume. However, there is no waiver fee associated with the waiver of volumes that do not result in an increase in downstream runoff.

RESPONSE: AS DISCUSSED IN THE RESPONSE TO COMMENT 1, A PRE VERSES POST DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS WILL BE CONDUCTED AS PART OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL TO SHOW THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT INCREASE FLOWS DOWNSTREAM.

48. The report concludes there is an approximate 200 cfs overflow for a 100-year event across Pinnacle Vista Road from the Pinnacle Vista Drive channel affecting the north portion of the proposed development. The report states this overflow will be conveyed to the large wash to the west in a channel. It should be noted this channel will need to be sizable to convey 200 cfs to the west and will cross the proposed out-parcel located along the northern boundary of the development and its access from Pinnacle Vista Drive. A preliminary design and layout of this channel should be provided as part of this report.

RESPONSE: THE DISCUSSION OF A CHANNEL TO CONVEY 200 CFS HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE REPORT DUE TO THE ONGOING DISCUSSION WITH CITY STAFF TO IDENTIFY A DIFFERENT SOLUTION FOR FLOWS CROSSING PINNACLE VISTA DRIVE. THE DISCUSSIONS ARE CURRENTLY UNDERWAY WITH CITY STAFF TO DETERMINE A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTION TO THE FLOWS CROSSING PINNACLE VISTA DRIVE. IT IS INTENDED FOR A SOLUTION TO BE SHOWN AND DISCUSSED AT THE PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL.

49. Provide evidence concerning about the ability of the area just downstream of the Cavalliere Park lower basin outlet structure, to withstand flows from less frequent events and redirect these flows westerly through the Pinnacle Vista Drive channel. Information has presented a recent failure at this location which likely occurred from a higher frequency, smaller flow rate event. The City would like to evaluate, with the developer and engineer, the concept of restoring the 100-year 550 cfs outflow from the Cavalliere Park lower basin directly across Pinnacle Vista Drive via a new culvert and

then through the eastern wash within the development as was historical for this wash. In the event flows are continued to be taken to the west, the report should discuss and evaluate this issue on a preliminary basis. Additionally, the preliminary report in support of the preliminary plat application will need to evaluate this issue in detail and address this issue in the design of the development.

RESPONSE: DISCUSSIONS ARE CURRENTLY UNDERWAY WITH CITY STAFF TO DETERMINE A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE SOLUTION TO THE FLOWS CROSSING PINNACLE VISTA DRIVE. IT IS INTENDED FOR A SOLUTION TO BE SHOWN AND DISCUSSED AT THE PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTAL.

50. Section 4.3 of the report states an "n" value of 0.035 was use for the channel and overbank areas in the HEC-RAS models. A value of 0.035 appears to be low for overbank areas based on the amount of vegetation present in these areas and the overbank roughness values should be reevaluated and the report updated.

RESPONSE: THE HEC-RAS MODEL HAS BEEN UPDATED WITH THE REVISED MANNING'S N VALUES. THE MANNING'S N VALUES HAVE BEEN VARIED BASED ON AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY

51. The report should include a disc containing HEC-1 and HEC-RAS models for City review.

RESPONSE: A DISC CONTAINING HEC-1 AND HEC-RAS MODELS ARE INCLUDED WITH THE REPORT FOR CITY REVIEW.

Water and Waste Water:

52. Please submit three (3) copies of the revised Water and Waste Water Design Report(s) with the original red-lined copy of the report with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A.

RESPONSE: REVISED REPORTS RESUBMITTED WITH REDLINES.

Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of this application. Please address the following:

Fire:

53. Update the narrative, or provide a note on proposed site plan stating, demonstrating residential turning radii (40.5') (DS&PM 2-1.801(5)).

RESPONSE: NOTE PROVIDED ON SUBDIVISION PLAN AND SITE PLAN.

54. Update the narrative, or provide a note on proposed site plan stating, demonstrating the existing and proposed hydrant locations (DS&PM 6-1.502).

RESPONSE: NOTE PROVIDED ON SUBDIVISION PLAN AND SITE PLAN.

55. Update the narrative, or provide a note on proposed site plan stating, demonstrating that the fire lane surface will support 83,000 lb. (Fire Ord. 4045, 2-1.802(3)).

RESPONSE: NOTE ADDED.

56. Update the narrative, or provide a note on proposed site plan stating, demonstrating that the divided entrances and drive thru by pass lanes shall be 20' wide minimum (DS&PM 2-1.802(2)).

RESPONSE: NOTE ADDED.

Circulation:

57. Owner/Applicant will likely need to construct a northbound right-turn deceleration lane at the site entrance on Alma School Parkway (DSPM Sec 5-3.206).

RESPONSE: NOTED. RIGHT TURN LANE SHOWN ON SITE PLAN.

58. Owner/Applicant will likely need to provide an exit-only site access onto Jomax Road to provide a secondary site access. Traffic Engineering Recommendation.

RESPONSE: PER CONVERSATION WITH TRANSPORTATION STAFF, A 20' EXIT ONLY ACCESS LANE/GATE WILL BE PROVIDED AT JOMAX RD.

59. Owner/Applicant will likely need to dedicate a 15 foot wide non-motorized public trail easement along the west side of Alma School Parkway along the site frontage (narrows at the south end).

RESPONSE: DEDICATION CAN BE PROVIDED ALONG FRONTAGE.

Water and Waste Water:

60. Please update water and wastewater design report to include the waterline looping through, and connecting, to the E. Bajada Drive line for second sourcing (DS+PM Sec. 6-6-1.402). Please select the best alignment around the existing rock outcroppings.

RESPONSE: WATERLINE LOOPING PROVIDED. REPORT UPDATED.

61. Please update water and wastewater design report showing sewer line extending to the property line, adjacent to E. Bajada Drive (DS+PM Sec. 7-1.400). Please select the best alignment, parallel to the above mentioned water line, for the best alignment around the existing rock outcroppings.

RESPONSE: SEWER STUB PROVIDED. REPORT UPDATED.

Technical Corrections

The following technical ordinance or policy related corrections have been identified in the first review of the project. These items 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:

Site:☐

62. Update the provided graphics to clearly define the property line between proposed lots "63" and "80."

RESPONSE: LOT LINES IDENTIFYING LOTS 63 AND 80, THE TWO 190,000 + S.F. LOTS, HAVE BEEN ADDED.

Circulation:☐

62. Traffic circles shall not be used for traffic control on internal street system intersections as shown adjacent to Lot 45. Roundabouts are an acceptable alternative to a standard intersection design.

RESPONSE: TRAFFIC CIRCLE HAS BEEN REMOVED PER YOUR REQUEST.

The revised application requirements and additional information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, and this written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above has been submitted for further review.

Thanks you!

Sincerely,

Michele Hammond
Berry Riddell & Rosensteel
6750 E Camelback Rd Ste 100
Scottsdale, AZ 85251



December 2, 2014

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

Re: 456-PA-2014
4-GP-2014 & 12-ZN-2014
Cavalliere Flat

Dear John Berry,

This is to advise you that the case referenced above was approved at the December 1, 2014 City Council meeting. Ordinance 4179 and resolution9944 may be obtained from the City Clerk's office or city website @ <https://eservices.scottsdaleaz.gov/eServices/ClerkDocs/Default.aspx>. Please remove the red hearing sign as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please contact me at 480-312-7849.

Sincerely,

Jesus Murillo
Senior Planner