

**Correspondence Between  
Staff and Applicant  
Approval Letter**



Planning & Development Services Department  
Planning and Neighborhood

7447 East Indian School Road  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

March 21, 2018

12-PP-2017  
Billy Cundiff  
Hines Interests Lp  
2375 E Camelback Rd Ste 150  
Phoenix, AZ 85016

**RE: PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL NOTIFICATION**

**Case Reference No:** 12-PP-2017 Asteria Highlands

The Development Review Board approved the above referenced case on March 15, 2018. For your use and reference, we have enclosed the following documents:

- Approved Stipulations/Ordinance Requirements
- Site Plan with Fire Dept. Requirements Notations
- Accepted Basis of Design Reports
- Accepted Case Drainage Report
- Site Plan with Street Naming Requirement Notations
- Construction Document Submittal Requirements/Instructions
- This approval expires two (2) years from date of approval if a permit has not been issued, or if no permit is required, work for which approval has been granted has not been completed.
  - These instructions are provided to you so that you may begin to assemble information you will need when submitting your construction documents to obtain a building permit. For assistance with the submittal instructions, please contact your project coordinator, Doris McClay, 480-312-4214.
- Table: "About Fees"
  - A brief overview of fee types. A plan review fee is paid when construction documents are submitted, after which construction may begin. You may review the current years fee schedule at: <http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/bldgresources/Fees/default.asp>

Please note that fees may change without notice. Since every project is unique and will have permit fees based upon its characteristics, some projects may require additional fees. Please contact the One Stop Shop at 480-312-2500.

**Finally, please note that as the applicant, it is your responsibility to distribute copies of all enclosed documents to any persons involved with this project, including but not limited to the owner, engineers, architect, and developer.**

Sincerely,

Doris McClay  
Senior Planner  
dmcclay@ScottsdaleAZ.gov



## **Geotechnical & Materials, Inc.**

December 13, 2017  
Alpha Project 17-G-7090

Hines  
2375 E Camelback Road, Suite 150  
Phoenix, AZ 85016

**Attention: Billy Cundiff**

**Re: Asteria Highlands Fire Truck Loading Letter  
Happy Valley Road and 128<sup>th</sup> Street  
Scottsdale, AZ**

Alpha Geotechnical & Materials, Inc. (Alpha) is pleased to present this recommendation letter for the proposed decomposed gravel road running east west on the Northern boundary of said project. This letter is based on an e-mail request from Mr. Billy Cundiff dated December 12, 2017.

### **1.0 PROJECT UNDERSTANDING**

A roadway utilizing the on-site decomposed gravels as base and surfacing material is planned running east to west along the northern boundary of the Asteria residential development. A geotechnical investigation was previously performed for this site by GEC for the Tiara Estates on-site infrastructure improvements SW of Happy Valley Road Alignment and 128<sup>th</sup> Street in Scottsdale Arizona, dated November 15, 2007.

A recommendation letter is required to address the planned decomposed granite roadway. Our understanding is that roads within the development will be constructed generally in a balanced fashion with shallow cuts and fills. We understand the subject roadway will not be heavily traveled, but will need to support a fire truck which could weigh up to 80,000 pounds. This roadway will also traverse the existing washes with fills and will cut into the native areas beyond the washes.

### **2.0 SITE CONDITIONS**

Our discussion of the site conditions is based solely on review of aerial photos (Google Earth) and from photos provided by the client. This currently undeveloped site is located at the southwest corner of the eastward extended alignment of Happy Valley Road and 128<sup>th</sup> Street in Scottsdale north of the McDowell Mountains. This area consists of native desert cacti, shrubs and trees which overlie sandy to clayey soils derived from decomposition of the underlying granite bedrock. The GEC report indicated non-plastic to medium plasticity silty to clayey sands (SM-SC) in the upper few feet grading into decomposed to highly weathered granite bedrock.

### **3.0 SUBGRADE SUPPORT CONDITIONS**

We anticipate that cuts will encounter the surficial residual soils and may also encounter decomposed granite bedrock. Fills developed from the cuts will consist of the materials described in Section 2.0. Based on review of the GEC report and our general knowledge of the site area, we anticipate the exposed subgrade beneath pavements should be of relative good

quality provided that site grading recommendations, as provided in the GEC report, and as amended herein, are followed.

#### 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

##### 4.1 Site Grading

In general, all plants including roots, trash or other debris should be cleared from the roadway prism extending a minimum of 3 feet horizontally beyond the edges of roadway cut and fill limits. The exposed subgrade should be scarified to a depth of at least 8 inches, moisture conditioned to within 2 percent of the optimum moisture content and compacted to a minimum of 98 percent of ASTM D 698 dry density. Fills placed above this exposed surface should also be moisture conditioned to within 2 percent of optimum moisture and compacted to at least 98 percent of ASTM D 698 dry density.

##### 4.2 Pavement Section

A decomposed granite surface section of at least 8 inches should be placed upon the compacted subgrade or underlying embankment fill. This material should have less than 20 percent minus 200 fines and should have a plasticity index of no greater than 13. Some of the on-site soils will not likely be suitable for this section. This layer should be moisture conditioned within minus 3 to plus 1 percent of optimum moisture and be compacted to a minimum of 100 percent of ASTM D698 dry density.

##### 4.3 Site Drainage and Slopes

Site drainage will be key in preventing failure of the subgrade. In no case should ponding of water be permitted either upon or adjacent to the roadway. Stormwater should be directed away from the roadway via culverts or other drainage conveyances. Permanent cut and fill slopes in these materials should not exceed 3h:1v and 4h:1v, respectively. Steeper slopes are possible, however, severe rutting may occur as these materials are considered to be erodible.

We appreciate you contacting Alpha for this work. Should you have any questions, or if we can be of any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact our office at (602) 453-3265.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alpha Geotechnical & Materials, Inc.



Keith Dahlen, P.E.  
Senior Geotechnical Engineer

Handwritten signature of Alf Wold.

Alf Wold  
Vice President

Digitally signed by Alf Wold  
DN: cn=Alf Wold,  
o=Alpha Geotechnical & Materials, Inc., ou,  
email=awold@alphageotech.com, c=US  
Date: 2017.12.13 21:13:22 -07'00'



January 4, 2018

Billy Cundiff  
Hines Interests Lp  
2375 E Camelback Rd Ste 150  
Phoenix, AZ 85016

RE: 12-PP-2017  
Asteria Highlands

Dear Mr. Cundiff:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 12/18/17. The following **2<sup>nd</sup> Review Comments** represent the review performed by our team, and is intended to provide you with guidance for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application.

**Zoning Ordinance and Scottsdale Revised 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. Please provide an archaeology survey and report that is prepared by a qualified archaeologist, in conformance with Scottsdale Revised Code, Chapter 46, Article VI. City code allows an exemption of 5 years for a master planned development that had an archaeological survey approved, but that exemption expired 5 years ago on the former Tiara Estates report. This report was not submitted with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submittal. **A copy of the report has been included in the submittal.**
2. The area of Undisturbed NAOS has decreased from the required 9.85 acres based on the Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1060.D.1 (70% of 14.07 acres). Please revise plans to comply with this requirement. **NAOS has been revised.**
3. The minimum width of Natural Area Open Space (NAOS) adjacent to right-of-way is 20 feet and 30 feet in all other areas (Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1060.F.1b). Please dimension the NAOS on Lot 1 adjacent to Tract A (required 30 feet), between Lots 11 and 12, between Lot 1 and Lot 18 and adjacent to Lot 8. Please revise the NAOS and any other areas where it is close to the required width. **NAOS widths have been updated.**

4. All lighting within Residential zoning districts has to be directed downward (Zoning Ordinance Section 7.602). Please select lighting fixtures which comply with this requirement. *See revised lighting.*

Water and Waste Water:

Discuss methodology used to determine Water and Wastewater capacity of the existing infrastructure with Scott Anderson in Water Resources department. Provide documentation of Water Resources acceptance of the methodology. *Per the meeting we have updated the wastewater report to stand alone from Storyrock and Sereno Canyon. A peaking factor of 4 was used per the meeting. A note has been added about the timing of offsite infrastructure. All offsite facilities to convey the waste water flows to the existing lift station will need to be either installed or bonded prior to the recordation of the Asteria Highlands Final Plat.*

5.

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:

6. Please indicate the sight distance visibility triangles on the entry enlargement plan. *The sight distance visibility triangles have been added.*

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review. The City will then review the revisions to determine if a decision regarding the application may be made, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional information is necessary.

**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 RETURN TO THE APPLICANT.**

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 39 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to be administratively complete.

These **2<sup>nd</sup> Review 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).

If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me at 480-312-4214 or at [dmcclay@ScottsdaleAZ.gov](mailto:dmcclay@ScottsdaleAZ.gov).

Sincerely,

Doris McClay  
Senior Planner

**ATTACHMENT A**  
**Resubmittal Checklist**

Case Number: 12-PP-2017

Please provide the following documents, in the quantities indicated, with the resubmittal (all plans larger than 8 ½ x11 shall be folded):

One copy: COVER LETTER – Respond to all the issues identified in the first review comment letter.

NAOS Plan:

\_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 24" x 36"      \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 11" x 17"      \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 8 ½" x 11"

Landscape Plan:

Color	_____	24" x 36"	_____	11" x 17"	_____	8 ½" x 11"
B/W	_____ 1 _____	24" x 36"	_____ 1 _____	11" x 17"	_____ 1 _____	8 ½" x 11"

Manufacturer Cut Sheets of All Proposed Lighting:

\_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 24" x 36"      \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 11" x 17"      \_\_\_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 8 ½" x 11"

\_\_\_\_\_

Other Supplemental Materials:

archaeology survey and report, acceptance letter by Water Resources

---

---





November 9, 2017

Billy Cundiff  
Hines Interests Lp  
2375 E Camelback Rd Ste 150  
Phoenix, AZ 85016

RE: 12-PP-2017  
Asteria Highlands

Dear Mr. Cundiff:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 10/4/17. The following **1<sup>st</sup> Review Comments** represent the review performed by our team, and is intended to provide you with guidance for compliance with city codes, policies, and guidelines related to this application.

#### **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. The Scenic Corridor setback from N. 128<sup>th</sup> Street stipulated in 2-ZN-2017 was a minimum of 100 feet measured from the right-of-way along the entire frontage. The preliminary plat submitted shows a portion of Lot 8 including a proposed retaining wall within the required Scenic Corridor. Please reconfigure Lot 8 to be outside the 100-foot-wide Scenic Corridor. Provide the lot area for Lot 8 and the remaining area as natural area open space in the adjacent tract include this information in the Lot and Tract area table on the preliminary plat and revise the NAOS plan (Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1060). **Lot 8 has been reconfigured.**
2. Please provide a boulder easement around the boulder feature on Lot 16 as stipulated in 2-ZN-2017. **A boulder easement has been added.**
3. The Desert Scenic Roadway buffer setback requirement from E. Alameda Road as stipulated in 2-ZN-2017 is a minimum of 30 feet in width with an average width of 50 feet from the E. Alameda Road right-of-way. Please show the required buffer setback and demonstrate the average 50 feet along the entire E. Alameda Road is being met. This buffer setback must be left undisturbed. **All of the building envelopes have been pulled back to a minimum of 30'. Open space corridors extend back**

**12-PP-2017**  
**12/18/17**

from all of the lots that far exceed to 50' requirement making an average that exceeds the 50'. All areas adjacent to Alameda Road and the northern building envelopes will be dedicated as NAOS.

4. The minimum width of Natural Area Open Space (NAOS) adjacent to right-of-way is 20 feet and 30 feet in all other areas (Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1060.F.1b). Please dimension the NAOS adjacent to E. Alameda Road. A portion of the NAOS proposed on Lot 1 doesn't meet the 30 feet width requirement. Please revise the NAOS and provide dimensions for all on-lot NAOS. **NAOS has been revised.**
5. All lighting within Residential zoning districts has to be directed downward (Zoning Ordinance Section 7.602). Please select lighting fixtures which comply with this requirement. **OK**
6. Please provide an archaeology survey and report that is prepared by a qualified archaeologist, in conformance with Scottsdale Revised Code, Chapter 46, Article VI. City code allows an exemption of 5 years for a master planned development that had an archaeological survey approved, but that exemption expired 5 years ago on the former Tiara Estates report. **See attached.**

Drainage: **Drainage comments resolved in meeting with Kimley-Horn drainage engineer and City reviewer.**

7. Please submit two (2) copies of the revised Drainage Report with the original red-lined copy of the report to your Project Coordinator with the rest of the resubmittal material identified in Attachment A. Please submit a CD with the drainage report containing a PDF file of the complete sealed and signed drainage report. Please include the digital DDMSW files, HEC-1 files and HEC-RAS files in the same CD. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A].
8. The Case Drainage Report which has been submitted with this Preliminary Plat (PP) case is pretty much the same drainage report that was submitted with the Zoning case (2-ZN-2017). This is not acceptable. While for a Zoning case a drainage report which is about 50% level of the Final Drainage Report is acceptable, but for a Preliminary Plat (PP) case the Case Drainage Report must be prepared which should be around 90% to 95% level of the Final Drainage Report. The Case Drainage Report that is submitted with this Preliminary Plat (PP) case is significantly deficient and must be revised. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
9. While a very small area of the larger offsite watershed is identified as Hillside Desert/District (HD), the rest of the watershed areas on both offsite watersheds are Upper Desert (UD). The Kb values should be around 0.3+ for all offsite and onsite watersheds whereas they are almost twice higher than that range (0.6+ ~ 0.7+) in the DDMSW analyses which is not acceptable. Please revise the Kb value by using "Minimal Roughness" for all areas except for the HD, especially for the onsite sub-watersheds under the proposed condition. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
10. The 24"X36" proposed condition Land Use Map provided in the drainage report must show COS zoning (R1-70 and R1-35) and not just the FCDMC's Land Use codes 120, 130 etc. The hydrologic coefficients for Land Use codes 120, 130 etc. are not exactly equivalent to the hydrologic coefficients for COS zoning R1-70 and/or for R1-35. The Engineer must create a table in the drainage report to show the hydrologic relevancy/relationship between the COS land use (R1-70 and R1-35) and the DDMSW land use (120, 130, etc.). [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
11. It is not allowed to overwrite the DDMSW calculated default Tc values for sub-watersheds unless the Engineer explains in the drainage report why such was done to the satisfaction of the reviewer. The explanations provided in the drainage report for the non-default Tc values with asterisks symbols do not seem to be adequate. The reviewer inquired with Ken Lewis, the writer of the DDMSW program

during a previous DDMSW training session about this matter and learned that such non-default  $T_c$  values with asterisks symbols are not typically the results of some kind of programming errors embedded in the DDMSW software. The reviewer will contact Ken Lewis and/or Carlos Carriaga at the FCDMC through email to get a further explanation in order to verify the Engineer's assertion of the DDMSW programming errors before approving the Case Drainage Report. Meanwhile, the Engineer must verify the "NMIN" coefficient in regards to the County's DS&PM as shown below, if these are applicable to his hydrologic analyses. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]

SECTION 4: UNIT HYDROGRAPH METHOD						
1	HEC-1 JOB CONTROL RECORDS					
a.	ID record. Are dates, project name, and modeler's name specified? Are they consistent with reports?					
b.	ID record. Are model revisions clearly identified on subsequent ID records?					
c.	IT record (NMIN). If NMIN has been revised, or changed for different models, were dependent parameters (UI, RM, NSTPS) adjusted appropriately?					
d.	IT record (NMIN). Is $0.1 T_c \leq NMIN \leq 0.25 T_c$ for the average value of $T_c$ for the watershed, and the maximum and minimum values? Double check sub-basin delineation if extreme values of $T_c$ make NMIN significantly outside the range.					
e.	IT record (NMIN). Is $NMIN < 0.25 T_c$ for the sub-basin with the shortest $T_c$ ?					
f.	IT record (NMIN). Can NMIN be adjusted so that NMIN is approximately equal to $0.15 T_c$ for the average value of $T_c$ ?					
g.	IT record (NMIN). Is $60/NMIN$ an integer?					
h.	IT record (NMIN). Is NMIN equal to or evenly divisible by JXMIN on the IN record?					
i.	IT record (NMIN, NQ). Is $NMIN \cdot NQ$ at least as long as the storm duration?					
j.	IN record (JXMIN). Is the IN record used correctly?					

Item	Description	YES	NO	N/A	*
b.	UC record ( $T_c$ ). Are $T_c$ parameters L, S, and $K_b$ reasonable?				
c.	Is $T_c < 90$ minutes for each sub-basin?				
d.	Does $T_c$ exceed the duration of rainfall excess for any sub-basin? This should be documented in the text.				
e.	UC record (R). Is $R \geq 0.5 \times NMIN$ ?				
f.	UC record ( $T_c$ ). Check against similar sub-basins. Are $T_c$ values reasonable?				
g.	UC record ( $T_c$ ). Were $T_c$ values checked to ensure that average velocities throughout the watershed are reasonable?				
h.	HC record. Are hydrographs combined properly?				
i.	HC record. Is $HC \leq 5$ ?				
j.	HC record (TAREA). Is total area correct? Was area above the concentration point manually recalculated for diverted hydrographs?				
k.	Other.				

12. 'Percent Imperviousness' (RTIMP) of 5 and 15 for R1-70 and R1-35 zoning are too low. Mass grading and large pads have been shown on the Preliminary Grading Plans for so many lots in the subdivision. Since NAOS is pre-defined for most of these lots, an RTIMP of about 50 in DDMSW seems to me more appropriate for the post-condition onsite sub-watersheds. The appropriate 'Zoning Type' (R1-70 and R1-35) must be looked at for post-condition onsite watersheds to estimate the appropriate 'Percent Imperviousness' (RTIMP) in DDMSW. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
13. Please provide a 24"X36" Rainfall Map in the drainage report by overlaying the sub-watersheds onto the FCDMC NOAA Atlas 14 shapefile and label the map index number (s) and the map cell cumber. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
14. Please provide 24"X36" Time of Concentration (Tc) Maps in the drainage report by overlaying the sub-watersheds and the Tc flowlines onto the COS quarter section topographic maps. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
15. To eliminate routing errors through storm drains when using Kinematic Wave method, see if developing stage-discharge rating tables outside of HEC-1 and then coding them directly into HEC-1 can help converge the model which can end normally. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
16. All "DTHETA" values must be changed to "NORMAL" from "DRY" in the DDMSW program for both existing and proposed conditions hydrologic analyses. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
17. All 50 cfs or larger washes must be analyzed by using the HEC-RAS models under both the existing and the proposed conditions. Please provide 24"X36" existing and proposed Floodplain Maps in the drainage report. Each culvert crossing along the 50 cfs or larger washes must be included in the HEC-RAS analyses. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1A]
18. The Preliminary Grading & Drainage (G&D) plan must be prepared to the 95% level of the Final G&D Improvement Plan. The wash crossing across the driveway to Lot 31 must be fully figured out on the Preliminary G&D Plan and must be included in the hydraulic analyses. [Reference: COS DSPM: Section 4-1.800 & Section 4-1B]

### **Significant Policy Related Issues**

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of this application. Even though some of 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:

#### **Landscape Design:**

19. Please add a note to the entry enlargement plan and the landscape/revegetation plan, as follows: Thorny trees, shrubs and cacti shall be planted so that their mature size/canopy will be at least 4 feet away from any walkways or parking area curbing. Please refer to DSPM Sec. 2-1.1001.13. **Ok.**
20. Please add a note to the landscape/revegetation plan, as follows: Plants that are proposed to be installed in basins will be in conformance with Design Standards and Policies Manual Section 2-1.903 Native Plants in Detention Basins and Drainage Channels. **Ok.**

### Water and Wastewater:

21. Provide analysis in the Basis of Design for the Wastewater on the existing lift station's capacity including the Storyrock subdivision flows. The lift station and capacity has been shown in the approved StoryRock masterplan. Asteria Highlands has 13 lots of existing capacity in the lift station from the Tiara Estates final plat and all liens have been resolved for them. The remaining capacity in the lift station is on a first come first served basis.
22. Sewer mains for this project must have an existing outlet for approval. The sewer outlet is called out as "future". A sewer outlet to a treatment facility is necessary. Show the proposed infrastructure necessary to have this subdivision as a stand-alone project to be constructed by this project. All the required 128<sup>th</sup> street infrastructure is shown on the 128<sup>th</sup> Street improvement plans submitted to the City by StoryRock. The Preliminary Plat has referenced the submittal with a note that the required infrastructure will need to be constructed concurrently/prior to approval of any onsite infrastructure.
23. Water mains must be looped to existing mains for approval. This subdivision cannot be approved without a looped water system to serve it. Show the proposed infrastructure necessary to service the subdivision as a stand-alone project to be constructed by this project. Per our conversations with the City Water Department Asteria Highlands will be serviced by the zone 13 waterline in the Alameda Road alignment until the future zone 13 waterline in Sereno Canyon is constructed by others.
24. All Water and Sewer mains in tracts or easements, which require specific approval from WR, will require:
  - a. Minimum width of 20-feet per DSPM Section 6-1.419 and Section 7-1.413.
  - b. Minimum 10 foot wide hardened surface for maintenance per DSPM Section 6-1.419 and Section 7-1.413. The water and sewer are located in a minimum of 20 foot easement and are located under a surface that will meet emergency access criteria

### Circulation:

25. Please demonstrate the following for E. Alameda Road on the Preliminary Plat, the proposed half street improvements: Per the project stipulations half street improvements are not required, only an emergency access road that meets fire department criteria.
  - a. Add a 20-foot minimum roadway section. A 20-foot decomposed granite surface is being constructed with the water and sewer line installation.
  - b. Add a pavement thickness section which must meet the 83,000 pounds gross vehicle weight. Per geotechnical letter submitted to the City the decomposed granite will meet the emergency access criteria
  - c. Show the drainage improvements needed to construct Alameda Road at 128<sup>th</sup> Street. All the water crossing the Alameda Road alignment will meet the at grade crossing requirements for emergency access vehicles.
  - d. Dead end streets require a turn-around per DSPM Section 5-3. E. Alameda Road requires some type of turn-around capability. A hammerhead turn around has been added at the end of the Alameda Road alignment.
26. Per DSPM Section 5-3.119 the intersection of Alameda Road must be perpendicular at the monument line of 128<sup>th</sup> Street or match an existing intersection on the east side of 128<sup>th</sup> Street. Please revise the plans. The

27. Auxiliary lanes (right turn and left turn lanes) must be designed per DSPM Section 5-3. Taper for the right turn lane must be 100 feet. Taper for the left turn lane must be designed per DSPM 5-3 and Section 430 of the ADOT Traffic Engineering Policies, Guidelines and Procedures Manual. Please revise plans to comply with these standards. **Turn lanes have been updated.**
28. Intersection and driveway departure sight distance requirements must be shown on the plans per DSPM Section 5-3.119. Please provide this information on the revised plans. Please utilize a dashed line to indicate the sight distance visibility triangles on the entry enlargement plan. Please refer to the Plan & Report Requirements for Development Applications. Please refer to the Scottsdale Design Standards & Policies Manual Section 5-3.119. Please refer to Zoning Ordinance Section 1.303. **Site visibility triangles have been added to the intersections and lots 1,2 and 31. All other lots do not have predetermined driveway locations.**
29. Please revise Tract D so that a pedestrian access path will be provided adjacent to the proposed vehicular gates to allow direct pedestrian access from 128<sup>th</sup> Street into Asteria Highlands. Please refer to Scottsdale Sensitive Design Principle 6 and Design Standards & Policies Manual, Section 3-1.200. **Pedestrian access will be adjacent to the entry street and has been labeled on the plat. A jog around the proposed gate has been added.**

### 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:

30. The plans state that an eight (8) foot trail may be required. This trail is stipulated in 2-ZN-2017. Please change “may” to “is” required and the location to be determined by the City’s Transportation Department at a later date. **Per the StoryRock plans the 8’ trail is located adjacent to the back of curb. The StoryRock plans are shown and referenced on our preliminary plat. Accordingly, the trail reference has been removed.**

#### Other:

31. Please be advised that per Ordinance 47-33 and 48-101 and DSPM Section 3; Certificated to Construct, Bonding and Assurances are required for this project. **Ok**
32. Please be advised that per City Code Section 48-100 and 48-101, the owner shall construct all public improvements required for approval of the land division. The preliminary plat must show and call out the infrastructure to be constructed by the owner to have a completed project. **All improvements have been called out and/or shown per our stipulations.**
33. Please be advised that unless previously constructed N. 128<sup>th</sup> Street full width will be required to be shown on this final plat as constructed by this development to Ranch Gate Road (stipulated in 2-ZN-2017). **Ok.**

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review. The City will then review

## **Cundiff, Billy**

---

**From:** Dennis Haley <DHaley@azdot.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, September 29, 2017 2:56 PM  
**To:** Cundiff, Billy  
**Cc:** Vanessa Nunez  
**Subject:** Asteria Highlands - Preliminary Plat

**RE:** Asteria Highlands  
Preliminary Plat  
128<sup>th</sup> St. & Alameda Rd.

Attn: Billy Cundiff

Thank you for your notice for the above-referenced development.

After review, the development location is more than 1/4 mile from any ADOT proposed or existing highway facility. As such, ADOT has no comment.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any further questions. We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment.

**Dennis Haley, SR/WA  
Right of Way Agent III  
ADOT ROW Project Coordinator  
Federal Lands Liaison**

205 S. 17th Ave MD: 612E  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
602-712-7432  
[WWW.AZDOT.GOV](http://WWW.AZDOT.GOV)



---

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the person(s)/entity(ies) named above and may contain confidential/privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.



7447 East Indian School Road  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

Date: 10/4/17  
Contact Name: Billy Cundiff  
Firm Name: Hines Interests LP  
Address: 2375 E. Camelback #150  
City, State, Zip: Phx, AZ 85016

RE: Application Accepted for Review.

945-PA-2016

Dear Mr. Cundiff:

It has been determined that your Development Application for Asteris Highlands 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: Doreis McClary  
Title: Sr. Planner  
Phone Number: (480) 312-4214  
Email Address: Dmcc19y@ScottsdaleAZ.gov





Planning and Development Services Division  
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: (480) 312 - \_\_\_\_\_  
Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_@ScottsdaleAZ.gov