

**Correspondence Between  
Staff and Applicant  
Approval Letter**

February 16, 2017

To: Keith Niederer  
City of Scottsdale Planning Dept.

RE: 10-GP-2016 & 27-ZN-2016  
Villages at Troon Mountain

Dear Keith,

Following are the responses to the City's 1<sup>st</sup> Review Letter dated January 17<sup>th</sup>.

**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. With the next submittal, please submit a revised Natural Area Open Space (NAOS) plan and calculations for the subject parcel, as well as the entire Village at Troon development. Please reference the latest NAOS plan/calculations shown on the parking revisions plan, dated 4/10/2008 (attached to this comment letter). A required and provided NAOS figure, with calculations shall be provided for the subject property, as well as the remainder property. Reference Section 6.1060 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Response:** The applicant has included a revised NAOS plan and calculations for the subject parcel to be in conformance with the approved NAOS plan for the overall Village at Troon development from the Parking Revisions Plan dated 4-10-2008 with this submittal. The Parking Revisions plan (dated 4-10-2008) calculated 223,314 SF of NAOS was required per Slope Analysis. The applicant at the time, provided and dedicated 231,553 SF of NAOS for all three phases of the development. The 4-10-2008 NAOS exhibit assumed 61,060 SF of the total 231,553 SF NAOS dedication would committed on Phase 3. The current applicant is honoring this dedication and is proposing a total of 90,095 SF of NAOS; all of which will be undisturbed. The Hillside Conservation area (40,240 SF) and credit was calculated in the 4-10-2008 Parking Revisions Plan NAOS and remains unchanged with this submittal.

2. With the next submittal, please revise the site plan and NAOS plan to show the existing to remain concrete sidewalk on the east side of the existing main driveway (101st). This area shall also be removed from the provided NAOS area.

**Response:** The site plan has been revised to show the existing five foot concrete sidewalk on the east side of the existing main driveway. This area has also been removed from the N.A.O.S dedicated area.

3. Per stipulation number 2 in case 10-ZN-2002, the scenic corridor width along Dynamite Blvd. shall be a minimum of 80-feet and an average of 100-feet in width, measured from the outside edge of Street right-of-way. The subject property is only proposing an 80-foot-wide Scenic Corridor. With the next submittal, please demonstrate that the remainder of the Village at Troon property can meet this 100-foot wide average Scenic Corridor width stipulation.

**Response:** The applicant is seeking to maintain the current 80' Scenic Corridor and Trail Easement from the original dedication recorded in 2004 (2004-1843407) and seek relief from the Scenic Desert Landscape Setback minimum width for single-family residential of 85 feet (*per Scenic Corridor Design Guidelines*). The current dedication exceeds the precedent of existing dedications along Dynamite Road (Alma School Parkway to Pima Road). The majority of this three mile stretch is developed, and will most likely not receive future Scenic Corridor dedications. Easement depths vary along this stretch of the Dynamite corridor; from no dedications to 60'. The Villages at Troon North's Scenic Corridor dedication exceeds any dedication in this area by at least 20'.

Irregular shape and hillside topography offer serious constraints that limit the ability to increase the Scenic Corridor. These constraints result in a limited developable area that is located at the north end of the site.

The surrounding communities voiced their preference on having any development be located as close to Dynamite as possible, in order to preserve the view corridors from the golf course and Pinnacle Canyon neighborhood. Respecting this request from the community also encourages an 80' Scenic Corridor.

4. Per Section 5.704.D.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, a building maybe constructed on the property line. However, if any yard is to be maintained, it shall not be less than 10-feet in depth. With the next submittal, clearly identify proposed property lines, zoning district boundary lines, and building setbacks.

**Response:** The submitted site plan has identified proposed property lines, zoning district boundaries, and building setbacks. Specific product has not yet been determined for the Village at Troon, the applicant anticipates that product may be attached but recognizes that a minimum setback of 10' will be provided where rear yards are provided.

### **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:

#### **General Plan:**

5. Please submit a revised application with requests for a non-major General Plan amendment from Commercial to Urban Neighborhoods for the area proposed for residential and the existing scenic corridor, and a non-major General Plan Amendment from Developed Open Space to Natural Open Space for the area with the existing NAOS (outside of the scenic

corridor and dedicated with recorded files 2007 1321743 and 2004 1483407) and the HC zoned area.

**Response:** The request has been updated accordingly.

6. Please consider the following goals and approaches in your resubmittal:
  - a. Further detail Land Use Goal 3, Approach 6 and address Land Use Goal 3, Approach 1 and Land Use Goal 4, Approach 5 and discuss the transitioning of land uses, development patterns, and character elements from the commercial development to the proposed residential (Urban Neighborhoods) development along with the surrounding residential development (Suburban Neighborhoods) and open space.
  - b. In relation to Land Use Goal 4 regarding maintaining a balance of land uses and a mixture of housing types, address the overall density of Troon (approved at an overall 1 du/ac), the increase of the proposed project to the overall density, and discuss the development potential of any other remaining parcels in Troon. Also discuss the application of the Urban Neighborhoods land use category in north Scottsdale. Existing Urban Neighborhoods developments range from approximately 2.8 du/ac to over 8 du/ac.
  - c. Please respond to Land Use Goal 4, Approach 1 detailing how the proposed project provides for a diversity of residential uses for the community, and an alternative development type adjacent to the golf course. Given the suggested price point, this may be more appropriate than Land Use Goal 4, Approach 4.
  - d. Land Use Goal 7, Approach 1 and how the proposed project, with its open space designations, will protect sensitive natural features and maintain the integrity of natural systems.
  - e. Please describe how the proposal will respond to Neighborhoods Goal 5, Approach 4 regarding the use of green building and sensitive design techniques. See <http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/green-building-program> for additional information.

**Response:** See revised Project Narrative pages 6 and 13-16.

Drainage:

**\*Response to Drainage comments 7-16 below provided via separate memo from Kimley-Horn and included with the updated Drainage Report.**

7. Please submit two (2) copies of the revised Drainage Report with the original red-lined copy of the report to me with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A.
8. Zoning case drainage reports and related information submitted in support of rezoning application should include a 50% level of design and analysis to allow an accurate review 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. With the next submittal, please submit a minimum 50% level of design drainage report. There will likely be new drainage comments upon review of the 2 submittal and drainage report. Please reference Section 4-1.804 & Appendix 4-1A of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.

9. With the next submittal, please submit a Grading and Drainage plan with the revised drainage report. The preliminary grading and drainage plan, in conjunction with the preliminary drainage report, comprise the two primary pieces of information required to review to evaluate the proposed project from a stormwater perspective. Please reference Section 4-1.900 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.
10. With the next submittal, please submit a revised drainage report that includes a summary table for the proposed on-site stormwater storage basin(s). The table should include basin identifiers, proposed basin volume(s), orifice size, maximum side slopes, maximum stage depth, inflow rates, peak outflow rates, the difference between peak inflow and outflow rates (attenuation), drain times, maximum storage volumes as determined from HEC-1 model for the 2, 10, and 100-year events, and whether the basin is off-line or in-line. Please reference Section 4-1.402 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.
11. With the next submittal, please submit a revised drainage report with a HEC-1 model that provides discharge analysis for the 2, 10, and 100-year events. Clearly depict pre and post development discharges on the plan. Please reference Section 4-1.402 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.
12. With the next submittal, please submit a revised drainage report that illustrates the project meets first flush requirements. The report should also address whether the proposed stormwater storage basins have been sized to meet the first flush requirement. Please reference Section 4-1.800 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.
13. With the next submittal, please submit a revised drainage report that includes a wash hydraulics summary table, which will identify wash entrance and exit locations to the proposed development with the following parameters (at a minimum): water surface elevations, critical water surface elevations, velocities, flow areas and channel top widths for pre and post development conditions. Please reference Section 4-1.800 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.
14. With the next submittal, please submit a lateral erosion setback analysis. Please note that the minimum setback for straight and curved wash reaches is 20-feet and 50-feet respectively. Please reference Section 4-1.901 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.
15. With the next submittal, submit a grading and drainage plan that shows site, privacy or retaining walls with the top and base of wall elevations being provided. Elevations should be provided at ends, changes in elevation, or as needed to provide a reasonable level of definition of the elevations of the walls. Please reference Section 4-1.402 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.

16. If there are proposed drainage improvement in the right-of-way, detail must be provided with the next submittal. Please reference Section 4-1.402 of the Design Standards and Polices Manual.

Circulation:

17. There will likely be a requirement to dedicate 65-feet of right-of-way along E. Dynamite Blvd, or provide documentation that it has been dedicated to the City in fee-title, and not as a roadway easement. Reference Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-10.

**Response:** Acknowledged.

18. With the next submittal, please revise the site plan showing a 45-foot outside turning radius for the cul-de-sac. The Design Standards and Policies Manual cul-de-sac standard detail includes an additional 5 feet of sidewalk or shoulder that can be used for the turning movement. The 40.5 feet of tract radius and pavement width is not acceptable. Please reference Sec. 5-3.1100; Fig. 5.3-50 of the Design Standards and Polices Manual.

**Response:** The site plan has been revised to conform to DSPM Sec. 5-3-50; Fig. 5.3-50. Labels have been added to call out the 45' outside turning radius and additional 5 feet of shoulder.

19. With the next submittal, please revise the site plan showing dimensions that all driveways contain 24-feet of pavement, excluding curb and gutter. Reference Sec. 9.106 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Response:** Dimensions have been added to show that all driveways contain 24-feet of pavement (face of curb), as well as reference to Sec. 8-3.200 of the DS&PM.

20. There will likely be a requirement to improve the existing pubic trail along the Dynamite frontage to current DSPM standards including using 4" compacted decomposed granite material and a straighter horizontal alignment. Please reference Sec. 8-3.200 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual.

**Response:** The existing partial trail along Dynamite frontage will be improved and extended with 4" compacted decomposed granite material. The revised Site Plan and Pedestrian & Vehicular Circulation Plan have been revised to show the new alignment and to reference Sec. 8-3.200 of the DS&PM.

21. Per Section 5-3 of the Design Standards and Policies Manual, entrance should be radial/perpendicular to the centerline of 101a Way. Please revise site plan accordingly.

**Response:** The proposed entrance is dictated by the existing curb, gutter, and asphalt. The applicant intends to use this predetermined location to respect surrounding vegetation and natural constraints of the site. The applicant does not intend to relocate the entry and believes the existing infrastructure sets a precedent for the future community.

22. Per Appendix 5-313 of the Design Standards and Polices Manual, the minimum tangent length for approaching intersections (measured from the edge of roadway) should be 150-feet. Please consider revise site plan accordingly.

**Response:** As stated above, street improvements have been constructed to set access from the existing commercial driveway into the future community. Due to topographic constraints it is not the intent of the applicant to reconstruct these existing improvements.

**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:

**Site:**

23. Existing site has multiple existing easements which may needs to be released prior to any final plan approval for this development. A Map of Release/Release of Easement application will likely be required.

**Response:** Acknowledged.

24. With the next submittal, please submit a revised site plan that labels the internal drive as a private driveway, and note that this will be a condo regime, and not fee-simple lots.

**Response:** The site plan has been revised to label the internal drive as a private driveway and note the condo plat regime.

25. With the next submittal, please revise plans to show the existing sidewalk to remain on the west side of the property.

**Response:** The updated site plan acknowledges the existing sidewalk on the west side of the property and calls it out to remain.

26. With the next submittal, please revise the plans to show the items listed on the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications.

**Response:** The applicant has reviewed the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications and has updated the submitted graphics to conform to these standards.

**Building Elevations:**

27. With the next submittal, please demonstrate that the proposed two-story building will comply with the allowable building height. Typically, this is done by providing a roof plan over natural grade topo.

**Response:** Exhibits provided to show building height conformance.

**Circulation:**

28. There will likely be a requirement that the owner obtain or provide evidence of an access easement from the adjacent property owner that allows access to this parcel from the entrance on E. Dynamite Boulevard. Currently there appears to only be an emergency vehicle access easement. Property needs to provide legal access.

**Response:** Acknowledged.

29. There will likely be a requirement to provide a new dedication changing the existing trail easement to a non-motorized public access easement. The easement shall be the same width as the scenic corridor —80 feet.

**Response:** Acknowledged.

30. With the next submittal, please submit a revised site plan aligning the on-site sidewalk at the site entrance with the existing sidewalk ramp and sidewalk crossing. Also, sidewalk ramps shall meet ADA requirements. Please reference Section 12-1 of the Design Standards and Polices Manual.

**Response:** The revised site plan has realigned the on-site sidewalk at the entrance with the existing sidewalk ramp and sidewalk crossing. All ramps meet the ADA requirements set forth in Section 12-1 of the DS&PM and have been called out.

31. Refuse enclosure shall be designed/constructed per COS Standard detail 2146-2.

**Response:** The community refuse container is designed to the City of Scottsdale Standard Detail 2146-2 and has been called out in the site plan.

Sincerely,



Michele Hammond  
Principal Planner



**ATTACHMENT A**

**Resubmittal Checklist**

Case Number: 27-ZN-2016.

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the resubmittal (all plans larger than 8½x11 shall be folded):

- X One copy: COVER LETIER - Respond to all the issues identified in the first review comment letter.
- X One copy: Revised CD of submittal (DWG or DWF format only)
- X One original: Letter of Authorization-actual owner of record
- X One copy: Revised Narrative for Project

X Context Aerial with the proposed Site Plan superimposed:

Color      1      24"x36"      1      11"x17"      1      8½"x11"

X Site Plan:

10      24"x36"      1      11"x17"      1      8½"x11"

X NAOS Plan:

2      24"x36"      1      11"x17"      1      8½"x11"

X Topography with Site Plan Superimposed:

1      24"x36"      1      11"x17"      1      8½"x11"

Technical Reports:

2      copies of Revised Drainage Report:

Resubmit the revised Drainage Reports to your Project Coordinator with any prior City mark-up documents.



Community & Economic Development Division  
Planning, Neighborhood & Transportation

7447 East Indian School Road  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

Date: 12-9-16  
Contact Name: Michele Hammond  
Firm name: Berry Riddell, LLC  
Address: 6750 E Camelback  
City, State Zip: Scottsdale, AZ 85251 #100

RE: Application Accepted for Review.  
389 - PA - 2016

Dear Ms. Hammond:

VILLAGES AT TROON  
~~TROON VILLAGES~~ NORTH

It has been determined that your Development Application for TROON VILLAGES NORTH has been accepted for review.

Upon completion of the Staff's review of the application material, I will inform you in writing or electronically either: 1) the steps necessary to submit additional information or corrections; 2) the date that your Development Application will be scheduled for a public hearing or, 3) City Staff will issue a written or electronic determination pertaining to this application. If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me.

Sincerely,

Name: DORIS McCarty  
Title: PLANNER  
Phone number: 480-312-4214  
Email address: dmccarty@scottsdaleaz.gov



**Community & Economic Development Division  
Planning, Neighborhood & Transportation**

7447 East Indian School Road  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contact Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Firm name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
City, State Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

RE: Minimal Submittal Comments  
\_\_\_\_\_ - PA- \_\_\_\_\_

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

It has been determined that your Development Application for \_\_\_\_\_ does not contain the minimal information, and has not been accepted for review.

Please refer to the application checklist and the Minimal Information to be Accepted for Review Checklist, and the Plan & Report Requirements pertaining to the minimal information necessary to be accepted for review.

**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. 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.**

These **Minimal Submittal 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).

Sincerely,

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email address: \_\_\_\_\_



June 14, 2017

John Berry/Michele Hammond  
Berry Riddell  
6750 E Camelback Rd Ste 100  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Re: 27-ZN-2016 & 10-GP-2016  
Villages at Troon North

Dear John Berry,

This is to advise you that the case referenced above was approved at the June 13, 2017 City Council meeting.

The Ordinance No. 4310 for 27-ZN-2016 and Resolution No. 10814 for 10-GP-2016 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 480-312-2953.

Sincerely,

Keith Niederer  
Senior Planner