



Correspondence Between Staff and Applicant

Approval Letter



August 2, 2019

Tom Kirk
Camelot Asset One LLC
6607 N Scottsdale Rd H 100
Scottsdale, AZ 85250

RE: 13-ZN-2019
Happy Valley 18
85T24 (Key Code)

***** Camelot Responses to City Comments are shown in RED below each comment. This response letter is dated October 14, 2019. *****

Tom Kirk:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 07/03/2019. The following 1st 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:

Application submittal requirements:

1. Please provide an updated Development Application, a signed Affidavit of Authority to Act, Letter of Authorization and a signed Appeals, Dedications, Exactions for the property owner of Parcel 1 (APN: 217-06-001C, Steven Barker 2017 Revised Living Trust, LLC) (Zoning Ordinance (ZO), Sec. 1.304.) –
 - a. **As of July 16, 2019, the Property Owner for Parcel 1 (217-06-001C) is Alicia Harrison. An updated Affidavit of Authorization to Act, Letter of Authorization, and a signed Appeals, Dedications and Exactions is included in this resubmittal package.**
2. The intent of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance is leave washes in place and in natural conditions where practical. When necessary, limited modifications to natural watercourses shall be designed in accordance with the standards specified in Chapter 37 (Floodplain and Stormwater Regulations). Prior to the next submittal, please submit a wash

13-ZN-2019
10/29/2019

modification application and justification for the request if the existing washes are altered and not protected within an easement or Tract (ZO Section 6.1070.G.I.).

- a. **A Wash Modification Application explaining our need for the modifications has been submitted to the City of Scottsdale.**
3. Please submit a revised copy of the Citizen Review Report summary to include details of the most recent public outreach efforts, including any additional public comments that may have been received. (ZO Sec. 1.305.C.2.b.) –
 - a. **An updated Citizen Review Report has been provided that describes the key issues that have been identified through the public involvement process.**

Zoning District Map Amendment:

4. Please provide a revised Project Narrative that includes an explanation on how the proposal meets the Planned Residential District findings set forth in the requested zoning district (ZO Section 6.200). Specifically discuss which requirements are requested to be amendment as part of the PRD overlay.
 - a. **Thank you for the direction. The Project Narrative has been revised and updated as requested.**

Amended Development Standards:

5. The zoning district map amendment site plan is dependent upon the request for amended development standards as outlined in ZO Sections 6.1083.E.1. (ESL), 6.212, 6.205.A, 6.207, and 6.210 (PRD). Please address the following;
 - Within a revised narrative, please discuss the justifications for the proposed amended development standards and any excess NAOS dedication in exchange of the amended standards. – **The Project Narrative has been revised as requested to include language justifying the proposed amended development standards.**
 - On a revised site plan, please provide a data table on a revised subdivision plan that outlines the development standards in comparison to the amended developments standards, and the allowable/provided reduction percentage. – **As requested, a data table is shown on the revised subdivision plan outlining the development standards vs. the amended development standards.**
 - Please note, it appears that the amended standards are not equal to or greater than the setbacks of the underlying zoning on adjacent parcels (ZO Section 6.1083.E.6). Please revise the site plan and amended standards accordingly. – **Thank you for the direction. The site plan and amended standards have been revised accordingly.**
 - Please provide a revised site plan that identifies and dimension the amended setbacks and lot width. – **A revised site plan has been included in the resubmittal that outlines the amended setbacks and lot width.**
 - Within the next submittal, please revise the amended development standards to acknowledge Zoning Ordinance Section 6.210, building height shall not exceed one (1) story within fifty (50) feet of an R1-district boundary line. – **As requested, the amended development standards acknowledge the building height Zoning Ordinance (6.210).**

- The maximum lot size reduction is 25% (minimum lots for R1-43 should be 32,250 sf; amended standards show 26,250 sf minimum lot size). Lots 5-7, 9-12, 15-16, 19 on preliminary plat are substandard (ZO Sec. 6.1083.E.1.). Please revise the amended development standards accordingly. – **The applicant requests to amend the development standards within the R1-43 PRD zoning classification to allow for a minimum lot size of 26,250 sf. The revised amended development standards outline this request.**
 - Demonstrate compliance with minimum lot width requirement for flag lots for ESL amended standards and/or within the definition of lot width (ZO Sec. 6.1083.E.8. and 3.100). – **Per ZO Sec. 6.1083.E.8. and 3.100, the minimum lot width for “flag lots” will be 20’. The width of flag lots within the revised site plan are all greater than 20’ and are dimensioned on the updated plan.**
6. The submitted zoning application is requesting a zoning district map amendment to rezone the property to Single-family Residential, Environmentally Sensitive Lands, Planned Regional District (R1-43 ESL PRD). Within the revised narrative please respond to the PRD design criteria set forth in ZO Sections 6.205.A, 6.212, 6.207, and 6.210 (PRD).
- a. **The revised narrative includes comments / responses related to the PRD design criteria**

Site Plan/Preliminary Plat:

7. In accordance with Sec. 6.213.1, Where a PRD project abuts an R-1 district, the buildings on the PRD shall be set back from the perimeter property line a distance at least as much as the required rear yard setback of the adjacent district. Within the next submittal, please provide setbacks on a revised site plan.
- a. **Setbacks have been included on the revised site plan**
8. Pursuant to ZO Section 6.1071.3. subdivision perimeter walls are prohibited unless allowed pursuant to the hardship exemption. Please either eliminate the walls along Happy Valley Road or submit a hardship exemptions application requesting Development Review Board approval.
- a. **The proposed project includes perimeter walls along the northern boundary of the site (along the Happy Valley Road frontage) and in smaller areas near the entry feature of the site along Alma School Road. These walls will be needed to enhance the “quality of life” of the future residents of this community. The perimeter walls will work to limit traffic noise impacts, as well as work to limit the visual disturbance that comes with living near a rather heavily travelled road. Similar walls were included in the recently approved Bronco and White Horse projects. A hardship exemption was not required in either of these past cases and as such, the applicant has not submitted a hardship exemption application for this project (per comments from our Planner).**
9. According to Resolution No. 6716 and 1-GP-2004, Happy Valley Road is designated as a Desert Scenic Roadway, which prohibits walls and other improvements. Please identify and dimensions the required setback 50-foot wide setback and eliminate the walls along Happy Valley Road.

- a. **This 50-foot wide buffered roadway has been dimensioned on the revised site plan. It should be noted that due to the required dedication of the additional 10' feet of ROW along the northern boundary of the site (as shown in the Happy Valley Capital Improvement Plan), there are a few small areas where the proposed curvilinear perimeter walls encroach into the 50' buffered roadway. These encroachments are very minimal and total 150 sq. feet in total.**
10. Pursuant to ZO Section 6.1083.E.6, setbacks on the perimeter of a subdivision or land division shall be equal to or greater than the setbacks of the underlying zoning on adjacent parcels. Please revise the site plan accordingly.
- a. **The site plan has been revised accordingly and the setbacks have been included on the revised site plan**
11. Lot 14 should have TRACT included so as to create a consistent buffer along the subject properties' west boundary. Where no tract exists ZO Sec. 6.1083.E.6 of applies and it appears there will be some non-conforming circumstances related to the rear-yard setback.
- a. **As noted, the site plan has been modified to include a TRACT along the lot's western boundary. It should be noted that the "Lot 14" in question is now "Lot 11" on the revised and updated site plan.**

Wall Plan:

12. Pursuant to ZO Section 6.1071.A.4., on lots larger than 35,000 square feet, individual or site walls shall be setback a minimum of fifteen (15) feet from a side or rear property line unless the parcel is adjacent to a NAOS Tract. On a revise wall exhibit, please identify and dimension easements and Tracts.
- a. **A revised wall exhibit has been provided to identify and outline the Subject Property's easements and Tracts. There are no planned lots that are larger than 35,000sf.**

Natural Area Open Space (NAOS):

13. Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1060.D.2. revegetated areas shall not exceed thirty (30) percent of the required NAOS. Please revise the NAOS exhibit to identify and dimension future easements that may conflict with what is identified as undisturbed NAOS. Please show all utility easements and manmade structures on the NAOS site plan.
- a. **The NAOS site plan has been updated as requested. The revegetated areas total 30% of the required NAOS on the updated site plan.**
14. Pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 6.1070.7. On-lot NAOS shall not be located within the required front yard where the front yard depth is less than forty (40) feet. The zoning district map amendment site plan is depending on the future approval of amended development standards. The requested amended development standards result in a front yard reduction to thirty (30) feet which is less than the allowed front yard depth of forty (40) feet. Please revise the NAOS site plan accordingly.
- a. **Pursuant to the update Site Plan, this condition does not exist anymore as there will be no On-lot NAOS.**

15. Please demonstrate compliance with the distribution of NAOS as outlined in ZO Section 6.1060.F.1. Please dimension the width and square footage (on-lot and Tract) of NAOS.
 - a. **The width and square footages of the NAOS has been dimensioned on the updated site plan.**
16. Per ZO Section 6.1090 (ESL submittal requirements) and DSPM Section 2-2.404 (1), please submit a NAOS analysis plan that includes all civil improvements and proposed construction envelopes. Please confirm all man-made structures including drainage headwalls, retaining walls, rip-rap, and sidewalks (“access to wash”) etc. are not located with NAOS. Please revise the NAOS configuration and calculations accordingly.
 - a. **An updated NAOS analysis plan based on the revised site plan is included within this submittal. The NAOS calculations have been revised accordingly.**
17. Please demonstrate that walls are not disrupting continuity of NAOS on adjacent lots or enclosing designated NAOS (ZO Section 6.1071.2.). The Wall Elevation/Details, Hardscape plan shows new walls within and along the edge of the NAOS. Please graphically depict, if any, individual lot or site walls associated with the proposed subdivision.
 - a. **The updated NAOS analysis shows that walls are not disrupting the continuity of the NAOS on adjacent lots. The perimeter site walls associated with the proposed subdivision are shown within this revised submittal.**

Native Plant Plan:

18. Within the next submittal, please provide a revised Native Plant Plan and Inventory to indicate all protected plant species located within undisturbed NAOS as “Remain in Place”. Please provide a revised inventory and Native Plant Plan with NAOS boundaries. Scottsdale Revised Code Section 46-116.
 - a. **A revised Native Plant Plan and Inventory has been provided within this resubmittal and revised as requested.**

Fire:

19. Fire hydrants to be provided in accordance with Fire Ord. 4283, 507.5.1.2. Please revise the site plan accordingly.
 - a. **The revised site plan outlines the location of the future required fire hydrants.**

Transportation:

20. The developer will likely be responsible for an in-lieu payment for Happy Valley Road improvements. The payment shall be based upon an engineer’s estimate as approved by City staff. The cost shall be based upon design and construction of one lane of pavement, bike lane, curb and gutter, and a six-foot wide sidewalk- street cross section to match the City’s Happy Valley Road capital improvement project. DSPM Sec. 5-3.100
 - a. **The applicant is aware of this likely responsibility and will provide any required in-lieu payments as needed.**
21. Please dedicate a minimum 30 feet of fee title right-of-way along the Alma School Road site frontage. DSPM Sec. 5-3.100; Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-10

- a. **The revised site plan incorporates 30 feet of fee title right-of-way along the Alma School Road site frontage**
22. Please dedicate 20 feet of fee title right-of-way along the Desert Vista Drive site frontage. DSPM Sec. 5-3.100; Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-10
 - a. **The site plan has been updated as requested to dedicate 20' of fee title ROW along the Desert Vista Drive site frontage**
23. Please dedicate the northern half of the cul-de-sac located on Desert Vista Drive in the southwestern portion of the site, 50-foot radius. DSPM Sec. 5-3.100; Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-10
 - a. **The site plan has been updated as requested to dedicate the northern half of the cul-de-sac located on Desert Vista Drive. It should be noted that the dedicated radius of the cul-de-sac will be 40.5' (as opposed to the 50' foot that has been called out). This amount will match the existing cul-de-sac radius to the south (as to be consistent).**
24. Please complete the local collector, Rural/ESL, street improvements along the Alma School Road site frontage – DSPM Figure 5-3.15, 24' of pavement width, plus roll curb or ribbon curb. DSPM Sec. 5-3.100
 - a. **The applicant will complete the local collector street improvements along the Alma School Road site frontage as required.**
25. Please dedicate additional right-of-way at the Alma School Road and Desert Vista Drive intersection to allow the street alignment and to avoid the existing wash crossing and box culvert.
 - a. **As shown on the revised site plan, the applicant has dedicated the requested additional ROW at the Alma School Road & Desert Vista Drive intersection.**

Engineering:

26. Off-site transportation, stormwater, and water resources improvements along property frontages to existing supporting infrastructure, with associated dedications are required. Please update the site plan accordingly (SRC 48-7, 47-10, 49-219).
 - a. **The site plan has been updated as requested to include the offsite improvements along the property frontages (i.e. the traffic roundabout at the intersection of Happy Valley Road & Alma School Road).**
27. Covenant to construct and assurances for public infrastructure will be required prior to final plat recordation (SRC Ch 48).
 - a. **The applicant is aware of this requirement.**

Archaeology

28. Please revise the Class III Cultural Resource Survey report for Case 13-ZN-2019 Happy Valley 18 as follows:
 - a. Throughout the report: whenever Happy Valley or Alma School are written, please include the word "East" or "North", respectively, and the word "Road" for each right-of-way. – **The naming convention of the streets has been updated as requested.**

- b. In the Project Location section: Figure 1 and Figure 2 indicate that this project area is in T4N, not T3N. Please revise accordingly. - **The typo reference to T3N has been corrected.**
- c. In the Physiographic Context section, in the final paragraph:
- 1) Revise the word “junkyard” to “storage yard”; **Revised as requested.**
 - 2) If the “trending trail” is visible and it may be the road depicted on the 1920 GLO map, then why was it not reported as a historic site, structure or an Isolated Occurrence? - **The alignment of the modern road does not correspond with the GLO road. We have included additional map research related to this question.**
 - 3) The “trending trail” or road needs to be identified on Figure 3. – **The Map has been updated to identify the “trending trail” as requested.**
- d. In the Survey Expectations section:
- 1) In the second sentence, An incorrect site number is cited - AZSITE indicates AZ U:5:278(ASM) is in the project area. AZ U:5:239(ASM) is 1/2 mile to the east. **This has been revised as noted.**
 - 2) In the last sentence, the project area is near an extensive upland village (AZ U:5:239[ASM]) and outlying activity areas could be anticipated. Please provide discussion on this proximity. **Additional discussion and reference of the noted site are included in the resubmittal.**
 - 3) Based on the prior references to the road on the 1920 GLO map, USGS maps, and aerial photography, it should be included in the Survey Expectations. Revise the report accordingly. **This was incorrectly identified in original report. The report has been updated accordingly.**
- e. In the Survey Results section, second paragraph, last sentence: the incorrect size is indicated for the project area. Revise the report accordingly. **The report has been revised as noted**
- f. In the Previously Recorded Sites section, AZ U:5:278(ASM):
- 1) The reference to cans needs to be revised to account for the church key can opener that started in 1835, so the 1800-1950 date in Table 4 can be refined somewhat. and since the beverage is probably beer there would be a hiatus between 1919-1934 due to Prohibition. **The updated report includes a revised date in the noted table based on all-steel beer can. The Church Key opener was introduced in 1894 as a tool for opening the then-new crown cap bottle closure. Beer wasn't sold in cans until 1935. The updated report includes added discussion and references.**
 - 2) This site is near the location of the 1920s road, which could be evidence of casual discard/littering and imply when the road was in use. **This could possibly be material dumped along a road as shown on 1965 topo map (which is not the 1920 alignment)**
- g. In the Isolated Occurrences section, IO-1:
- 1) Hole in top and meat tins (presumably taper strip opening) suggest post-1900, post-1866, and post-1875 dates (going as late as 1920s or later) for the artifacts. Activities in the project area that could be related to these dates are ranching, military, or mining. No mention of these activities is made in the Historic Context

setting, which leaves Berger's recommendation as plausible without further information. **As noted, these are probably relatively modern artifacts—no hole-in-caps for example, and a single episode dump not (meaningfully) associated with ranching, etc.**

- 2) Provide a map of IO-1 and if it is near the location of 1920s road then also include it on the map. A photograph or two of site and/or artifacts would be useful. Especially meat tins, which could be key-wind opened (post 1895) or tapered (post 1875). **As requested, an available photograph of the site was added within the updated report. The IO is shown on the map in the Appendix.**
- h. In the Management Recommendations section:
- 1) In the first paragraph, first sentence, revise the spelling of the word “neat” to “near”. **This has been corrected as requested.**
 - 2) Provide additional discussion to support the recommendation. The 1920s road needs further consideration of origin (ranching, mining, military) and comparison to historic context. Why did the Berger survey consider it eligible? Did Berger mention anything specific in their historic context that explains why it was eligible? The historic context in this report should review: 1) military circuit made around the McDowell Mountains ca. 1870s; 2) ranching of Ochoa, Brown and others ca. 1880s-1950s in north Scottsdale (refer to Archaeological Consulting Services report "Broken Down Cowboys"); and 3) mining claims beyond the 1-mile study area include at least one adit and mineral claim by EO Brown that is near Mineral Springs, 2-3 miles southeast of the project area. Based on a summary of these topics evaluate whether this dump is possibly related to any of them. **As requested, the Culture History section within the report has been expanded. Additionally, and as noted above, the 1920s road was incorrectly identified in the last report.**
 - 3) In the first paragraph, the fourth and fifth sentences appear to be redundant. Either delete one of them or combine them. **As requested, this paragraph has been revised.**
 - 4) In the last paragraph, the ARS 41-865 reference is incomplete. Revise it to include the requirement to protect the resource, allow Tribal attendance to the human remains, and recovery. **As requested, the reference in the last paragraph has been revised to more closely reproduce the language of ARS 41-865**

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:

2001 General Plan Analysis:

29. It is not clear as to where the proposed development will be providing the stated perimeter site/sound walls. The response to Goal 1 of the Character and Design Element found of page 28 of the first submittal states that sound walls will be developed as a means to mitigate the effects of the adjacent transportation corridor. Because the provided site plan identifies construction envelopes and perimeter walls are not permitted within the Desert Scenic

Roadway setbacks, please revise the narrative to clearly identify if perimeter/sound walls are to be provided with the proposed development. If there are to be such improvements:

Please graphically depict walls associated with the proposed subdivision to be constructed outside of the Desert Scenic Roadway setback and please expand the response within the project narrative as to the consideration made in locating the wall and further, how the goal of preserving NAOS will be maintained. Please consider Goal 4 of the Character and Design Element, bullets 9 and 10.

- a. **The narrative has been updated as requested. The applicant intends to construct subdivision perimeter walls on its northern boundary (along the Happy Valley Road frontage) and along a smaller section of Alma School Road near the proposed entrance to the project. These walls will be needed to enhance the “quality of life” of the future residents of this community. The perimeter walls will work to limit traffic noise impacts, as well as work to limit the visual disturbance that comes with living near a rather heavily travelled road. It should also be noted that due to the required dedication of the additional 10’ feet of ROW along the northern boundary of the site (as shown in the Happy Valley Capital Improvement Plan), there are a few small areas where the proposed curvilinear perimeter walls encroach into the 50’ buffered roadway. These encroachments are very minimal and total 150 sq. feet in total. These minor encroachments are offset by sections of wall that expand the depth of the 50’ buffer area by 4'-6' for significant stretches that are more than 6 times the encroachment area. These offset areas total 1,000+ sq. feet. As noted, our objective with this wall is twofold. The primary goal is to mitigate the visual and sound impacts of traffic from Happy Valley and the secondary goal is to provide an aesthetically pleasing design by avoiding linear wall sections.**

30. As a response to Goal 1 of the Community Involvement Element, with a resubmittal, please provide an updated Citizen Involvement Report that describes the key issues that have been identified through the public involvement process.

- a. **An updated Citizen Review Report has been provided that describes the key issues that have been identified through the public involvement process.**

Site Design/Preliminary Plat/Grading and Drainage Plan:

31. According to the DSPM Section 2-1, development along the perimeter of a new subdivision should be minimized. In particular, the lots in the new subdivision should not be more than 18 inches above the abutting lots in the existing subdivision. If greater grade change is desired, there should be a buffer or a gradual grade transition on the new subdivision in order to minimize the change at the property line. Please submit a revised grading and drainage plan and preliminary plat plan that demonstrates compliance with this policy by providing off-site spot elevations. Please label existing and proposed contour lines on a revised grading and drainage plan.

- a. **An updated Grading & Drainage Plan and Preliminary Plat are included within this updated submittal. The revised Grading and Drainage plan labels the contour lines as requested. Additionally, it should be noted that the applicant has provided a 49’ to 75’ wide buffer between the proposed perimeter lots and the**

abutting lots in the existing subdivision (as outlined on the included revised Preliminary Plat).

32. According to Section 2-1.1105 of the DSPM, Flag lots should not be used regularly in the layout of subdivisions. However, where there are major washes, rock formations or steeper slopes that would cause a street extension to achieve frontage to each lot to result in significant cuts and fills, flag lots can be used to reduce the physical impact of providing access and utilities to lots in sensitive areas. Please submit a revised site plan that identifies all major washes, rock formation and steep slopes to justify the need for flag lots.
- a. **Per ESLO 6.1083 E8, the applicant has incorporated flag lots into the design of the community as we believe these lots will better achieve the purpose of the Environmentally Sensitive Land Ordinance. The Flag lots included within the community are lots 1,2,5, & 13. Lots 1 and 2 are planned as flag lots to create a larger separation from the proposed future City-installed round-a-bout at the intersection of Happy Valley Road & Alma School Road. Lots 5 and 13 are planned as flag lots due to the location of the major wash corridor that cuts across the Subject Property. As requested, the major wash corridor has been identified on the revised site plan.**
33. The intent of ESL is to protect environment features and to leave significant desert washes in place and in natural condition. Site plan designs should accommodate natural desert washes in a natural condition and in their native locations. On revised plans, please demonstrate how the existing washes will be protected in an easement or Tract. (DSPM Chapter 2-2.201.F.).
- a. **The applicant has made significant site plan changes in order to leave the major wash corridor undisturbed. There will be only one wash crossing and it will be with the use of a box culvert.**
34. Per DSPM 2-2.501.B, where site walls are provided or intended to be provided, undulating and/or curvilinear walls should be provided along the perimeters instead of linear walls. Where linear property lines are provided, restrictive easements should be provided on each lot to define the wall layout as outlined above.
- a. **The applicant intends to construct subdivision perimeter walls on its northern boundary (along the Happy Valley Road frontage) and along a smaller section of Alma School Road near the proposed entrance to the project. As shown on the updated wall plan/exhibit, the proposed wall will be curvilinear as requested.**
35. Please clearly label the construction envelope and Natural Area Open Space on a revised grading and drainage plan. Grading is allowed to occur only within an approved construction envelope and is not permitted within designated undisturbed Natural Area Open Space. DSPM Section 2-2.404, 2-1.1105 and Zoning Ordinance Figure 6.1070. (B).
- a. **The Grading and Drainage Plan has been updated as requested.**
36. Per the DSPM Section 2-1.1104.(C)., gated streets should only be used where there are sufficient lots available to support future maintenance and reconstruction of the streets therefore gated subdivisions should be avoided of less than 20 lots.
- a. **The Property incorporates 21 single-family lots and as such the applicant believes the Community will be enhanced by being gated.**

37. Per the DSPM Section 2-1.1104. (B). Pedestrian connections to adjacent properties or street should be provided, please provide a trail that connects to the proposed sidewalk along N. Happy Valley Road.
- a. **On the revised Site Plan, the entrance to the community was moved to Alma School Road. The applicant has provided an 8-foot wide trail along the Alma School Road frontage of the Property which connects with the proposed sidewalk along N. Happy Valley Road.**
38. Per the DSPM Section 2-1.1103. (D). Grade changes should not be more than eighteen (18) inches above the abutting lots in the existing subdivision. Please provide contour lines and finished pad elevations of the adjacent residential lots.
- a. **As noted above in item 31, the applicant has provided a 49' to 75' wide buffer between the proposed perimeter lots and the abutting lots in the existing subdivision. Contour lines and approximate finished pad elevations for the neighboring lots are provided on the updated site plan.**

Wall Plan:

39. Where on-site walls are placed adjacent to NAOS areas at least 50 percent of the wall surface shall be a view fence (DSPM Section 2-2.501.B.2.s).. Please reference wall types on a wall plan and reference the appropriate detail.
- a. **A wall plan that meets this requirement will be produced, along with individual Grading and Drainage plans, upon the sale of the lot to a 3rd party homebuyer.**
40. No exterior paint colors shall have a Light Reflective Value (LRV) greater than thirty-five (35) percent, please provide the LRV for all new paint colors (ZO Section 6.1070.G.1.g.).
- a. **The applicant understands this requirement and will comply.**
41. Exterior paint and material colors shall not exceed a value of six (6) and a chroma of six (6) as indicated in the Munsell Book of Color. Within the next submittal, please provide the chroma value.
- a. **The applicant understands this requirement and will comply when a color-scheme has been selected.**

Transportation:

42. Since the site has frontage on a collector street, site access should not be located on the arterial street frontage. Please relocate the site entry to Alma School Road, this improves safety for vehicles entering and leaving the site. DSPM 5-3.201
- a. **As requested, the site entry has been relocated on the updated Site Plan to provide entry off of Alma School Road versus Happy Valley Road.**
43. Please construct an 8-foot wide multi-use trail (non-paved) along the Alma School Road and Happy Valley Road frontages. Please dedicate a non-motorized public access easement to accommodate any portions of the trail that extend outside of the right-of-way. DSPM Sec. 8-3.200, Trail Classifications, 8-3.203; Ad Hoc Citizens Trails Task Force Final Report 2009.

- a. **As shown within this resubmittal, the applicant intends to comply with this request by providing an 8-foot wide multi-use trail along the Alma School Road frontage. None of this multi-use trail is anticipated to extend outside of the right-of-way, and as such no public access easements will be needed. Additionally, the applicant will be providing an 8-foot sidewalk from the entry at Alma School north to Happy Valley Road. It should be noted that the applicant has not provided a multi-use trail along the northern perimeter of the site (along the Happy Valley frontage) due to the existence of a future City installed sidewalk along the same frontage that will be provided pursuant to the Happy Valley Road Capital Improvement Project.**
44. Please construct an 8-foot wide shared-use path (concrete) along the Alma School Road frontage. DSPM Sec. 5-7.200, Facilities, 5-7.202
 - a. **As noted above, the applicant intends to comply with this request providing an 8-foot sidewalk from the entry at Alma School north to Happy Valley Road. This sidewalk will be in addition to the 8-foot wide multi-use trail that will be provided along the Alma School Road frontage.**
45. To be consistent with the Happy Valley Road Capital Improvement Project, please dedicate a 50-foot by 50-foot right-of-way triangle at the intersection of Happy Valley Road and Alma School Road.
 - a. **The revised site plan includes a 50' X 50' right-of-way triangle, as requested.**
46. To be consistent with the Happy Valley Road Capital Improvement Project, please dedicate an additional 10 feet of right-of-way along the Happy Valley Road site frontage.
 - a. **Pursuant to the Happy Valley Road Capital Improvement Project plans, the applicant has dedicated an additional 10' feet of right-of-way along the northern boundary of the site (the Happy Valley Road frontage).**
47. Consistent with the Happy Valley Road Capital Improvement Project, dedicate 50 foot of right-of-way (from monument line) along the northern 450 feet of Alma School Road site frontage.
 - a. **This dedication is included with the resubmittal and updated site plan.**
48. Please dedicate safety triangles at the site entry street and Alma School Road intersection. DSPM 5-3.123; Fig. 5-3.27
 - a. **Site visibility triangles will be dedicated as requested.**
49. Project adjacent street volumes per DSPM 5-1.101 B2. DO-8/1/19 DSPM 5-1.101 B2
 - a. **The projected street volumes are included within the revised Traffic Impact Analysis Report.**

Traffic Study Comments: - **The Traffic Study has been revised to incorporate the changes and updates requested below.**

50. The study includes a speculative trip generation comparison to non-existing and non-prior approved land uses (maximum dwelling units under current zoning). TIMA's should not have trip generation comparisons other than what is required per DSPM 5-1.101 B3 – existing land uses and/or previously approved developments under current zoning, if applicable (DSPM Sections, 5-1.101 B3).

- a. **The study was revised to remove the trip generation comparison as requested.**

Additionally, please address the following in a revised TIMA;

- Please state any required off-site improvements that are required with the project. These may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. Half-street improvement of Happy Valley Road along property frontage.
 - b. Half-street improvement of Alma School Road along property frontage.
 - c. Planned trails, shared use paths.
 - d. Turn lanes approaching site access point(s)
 - e. Update TIMA with any needed changes per transportation comments.

The traffic statement was revised to add discussion regarding the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) along Happy Valley Road and the portion of Alma School Road north of the site driveway. This site is anticipated to provide curb and gutter per the City of Scottsdale's standard collector street section from the CIP project limits, just north of the site driveway, to the south parcel boundary along the frontage.

Stormwater: - **The Drainage Report has been revised to incorporate the changes and updates requested below.**

51. Please address the following comment and submit two (2) copies of the revised Drainage Report with the original red-lined copy of the report:

- A Preliminary Drainage Report and a Preliminary Grading & Drainage (G&D) Plan associated with a Zoning Case (ZN) requires a minimum of 50% information of the final drainage report and the construction documents (i.e. Civil Improvement Plans). Please demonstrate in a revised report and G&D plan (DSPM, Section 4).
 - a. **This comment was discussed with the reviewer at the requested meeting, and the report and plans have been revised to included 50% or more of the final information required.**
- While the preliminary drainage report contains anywhere between 50% to 100% of hydrologic analysis, but the report does not contain any kind of hydraulic analysis at all. The revised report must contain at least 50% hydraulics information of the final drainage report (DSPM, Section 4).
 - a. **The new channel and storm drain conveying the offsite shown in the previous submittal is no longer included.**
- Please either turn on the COS 2005/2007 digital quarter section topography on the existing and proposed condition watershed maps (on Figure 3 and Figure 4) or show a separate 24"X36" existing condition watershed map based on the COS 2005/2007 digital quarter section topography alone if Figure 3 becomes too crowded when both the aerial and the topography are shown together. Include a separate 24"X36" proposed condition watershed map based on the COS 2005/2007 digital quarter section topography as well as proposed onsite contours if Figure 4 becomes too crowded when both the aerial and the topography are shown together (DSPM, Section 4)

a. Updated and revised as requested.

- Please create a "proposed condition" elevation-area-volume table in the text section of the report in support of the HEC-1 STORAGE FACILITIES table which is printed out from DDMSW. Also, show separate hydraulic calculations in the report for the Elevation-Discharge relationships for the same HEC-1 HEC-1 STORAGE FACILITIES table as well (i.e. for bleed off pipe flow, spillway overflow, etc.) in support of the DDMSW printout (DSPM, Section 4).

a. The requested table was added to the report and the requested hydraulic calculations were added to the appendix.

- There are so many non-default Tc values under the proposed condition DDMSW SUB BASIN table. Please state if these are program calculated or manual overwritten values and give appropriate explanations in the report. Upload the DDMSW file and the HEC-1 input and output files in ZIP formats with the next submittal or email them directly to the reviewer (DSPM, Section 4).

a. A section was added to the report with included appendices to note why the asterisk is shown. No changes were made to the default values of land use.

- While the project meets the pre- vs. post- peak discharge requirements for the 2-year, 10-year, & the 100-year storm events in order to qualify for not requiring any onsite stormwater storage due to ESL ordinance conflicts, but the proposed lot grading does not meet the first flush water quality requirement for at least 8 out of 21 newly created lots which make up a significantly large area. The Engineer must schedule a meeting with the Stormwater reviewer and Richard Anderson (the Stormwater Engineering Manager) to discuss this review comment (DSPM, Section 4).

a. All roadways are being routed to the new detention basins before discharging to the washes. There are multiple backs of lots that will discharge without passing through detention. This was discussed at prior meeting and approved.

- Piping the large offsite wash for most of the part as it runs through the subdivision as well as forcing its open channel portion to make a 90-degree turn are unacceptable to the City because of potential sedimentation and maintenance issues. The Engineer must schedule a meeting with the Stormwater reviewer and Richard Anderson (the Stormwater Engineering Manager) to discuss this review comment. (DSPM, Section 4).

a. This comment was discussed with the reviewer at a requested meeting, and the site plan has been revised to eliminate 90-degree turns and piping where possible.

- Additional review comments may be expected in the next cycle once the Stormwater reviewer reviews the digital DDMSW & HEC-1 files and based on how well the Engineer addresses these sets of review comments in the next submittal.

a. DDMSW/HEC-1 Files are included. Please contact if there are issues with the electronic files.

Water and Waste Water: **The Water and Wastewater Design Reports has been revised to incorporate the changes and updates requested below.**

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 and address the following:

- The hydraulic/flow analysis was done for the proposed pipe, however, please revise the reports to include information on how the new flows will impact the existing 12-inch sewer (DSPM-7-1.201).
 - a. **Per the City of Scottsdale, the existing sewer in Alma Scholl is flowing at a d/D of .4325. The addition of 21 units will have negligible impact on the sewer. See data below supplied by the City.**

Flow Through 12" Pipe					
Peak Flow =	1.339	mgd =	929.86	gpm =	2.07 cfs
Min Flow =	0.299	mgd =	207.64	gpm =	0.46 cfs
Avg Flow =	0.684319	mgd =	475.22	gpm =	1.06 cfs
Max Depth =	5.19	inch =	0.4325	d/D ratio	
Min Depth =	2.28	inch =	0.19	d/D ratio	
Max Velocity =	6.88	ft/s			
Min Velocity =	4.34	ft/s			
Avg Velocity =	5.79	ft/s			

- The Sewer Basis of Design (BOD) Report lacks information on the Preliminary Design and information on the site, sewer easement, project dimensions, and design information about pipe material and strength class. (DSPM 7-1.201).
 - a. **The report (section 2.1) and exhibits have been updated to show additional detail, including connection details and material details.**
- Within the Water BOD Report please include the following; narrative, pipeline material and class information, site information, and general detail required to describe and understand the preliminary design. Additionally, please provide connection, isolation, and appurtenance information (DSPM Sections 6-1.201,1.202).
 - a. **The report (section 4.3) and exhibits have been updated to include connection and construction details.**
- In the final Water BOD Report and design, the piping system will be required to indicate the pipe segments that require thrust restraint and the method of thrust restraint. DSPM 6-1.411
 - a. **Thrust restraint and the method of thrust restraint for the proposed water main will be added in the final Water BOD.**

- The connection of the proposed/existing water main must be described whether it is a tee with isolation valves or a tap with isolation valves. Isolation valving is to be indicated on the proposed water main. DSPM 6-1.409
 - a. **The connection details have been added into section 4.3. Both will require tee to be cut in.**

- The sewer line along Alma School Rd has steep slope downstream of this development. Additional sewer flow from this development will contribute to higher velocity in the sewer line and aggravate odor issue. In order to alleviate this, an odor control chemical dosing station would be required at the site. The developer shall provide a chemical dosing station at the site at their expense and dedicate it to the City for future access, operation and maintenance. The dosing station, at a minimum, shall include a concrete pad with provision for future canopy, a screen wall, access gate, chemical (bleach) storage tank, dosing equipment, power, lighting and all required plumbing for drain, water, dosing line to a manhole etc. The developer shall coordinate with Water Resources Department for footprint of the dosing station, and preferences on the dosing station equipment, tank and materials.
 - a. **The following section has been added to the Sewer BOD**
Due to odor issues in the Alma School sewer, a chemical dosing station will be required with site dimensions of 30 ft X 40 ft . The site will have access to a manhole for the chemical feed. Final determination of the design and location will be made at the time of preliminary plat and will be made as a stipulation of approval

Engineering:

53. Per DSPM Sections 5-3.107 & 5-3.110, please dedicate and construct two (2) travel lanes (one in each directions) and a minimum 6-foot wide sidewalk within project boundary, to include a 40-foot full street right-of-way and a 12-foot wide travel lane inclusive of ribbon/rolled curb. Please update the site plan accordingly
 - a. **Within the revised site plan, the applicant has dedicated two (2) 14-foot travel lanes. The applicant is not intending to include sidewalks within the Subdivision and as such no sidewalks have been provided or will be dedicated within the project boundary.**

54. Per DSPM Section 5-3.800, the cul de sac right-of-way radii shall be fifty (50) feet minimum. Please update the site plan accordingly.
 - a. **The site plan has been updated as requested to provide for the fifty (50) foot minimum cul-de-sac right-of-way.**

55. Per DSPM Sections 6-1.202 & 7-1.201, the Preliminary Basis of Design Reports must be reviewed and accepted by the Water Resources Department prior to zoning approval. Please update the reports accordingly
 - a. **The applicant understands this requirement and the reports have been updated accordingly.**

Landscape Design:

56. Please provide a landscape plan that complies with ZO Section 10.200.B. Please identify and dimension existing and proposed NAOS tracts, easements and right-of-way.

- a. **The updated provided landscape plan complies with ZO Section 10.200B as requested. The NAOS tracts, easements, and right-of-way(s) have been identified.**

57. Trees should be provided at the rate of 1 tree per each 35 linear feet of median length. The minimum size is 15 gallons with fifty (50) percent to be provided as mature trees or larger (as defined in Article III of the Zoning Ordinance). Please revise the landscape plan accordingly.

- a. **We believe this comment is misplaced and/or a carry-over from a prior project. Regardless, the applicant will meet the required minimum landscape requirements.**

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 Plan/Preliminary Plat:

58. The Conceptual Site Plan denotes 29.9 gross acres while PP shows 28.59 – please clarify upon resubmittal.

- a. **The correct acreage is provided within this resubmittal.**

NAOS Plan:

59. Please identify the line weight located on the northern and eastern property lines on lots 21 and 22.

- a. **There are no conflicting line-weights on the Property lines of the revised site plan included in the resubmittal.**

60. On a revised NAOS plan, please provide the square footage and acres located within Tract NAOS.

- a. **The NAOS plan has been revised as requested.**

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional/supplemental 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 the application is to be scheduled for a hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional/supplemental information is necessary. Please call 480-312-7767 to schedule a resubmittal meeting with me prior to your planned resubmittal date.

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 22 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to have the minimal information to be reviewed.

These 1st 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 480-312-4211 or at mtessier@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MT', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Meredith Tessier
Senior Planner



December 16, 2019

Tom Kirk
Camelot Asset One LLC
6607 N Scottsdale Rd H 100
Scottsdale, AZ 85250

RE: ~~13-ZN-2017~~ **13-ZN-2019**
Happy Valley 18
KEY CODE - 85T24

***** Camelot Responses to City Comments are shown in RED below each comment. This response letter is dated January 24, 2020 *****

Tom Kirk:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 10/29/2019. The following 2nd 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 second 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 District Map Amendment:

1. Please provide a revised Project Narrative that includes an explanation on how the proposal meets the Planned Residential District findings set forth in the requested zoning district (Zoning Ordinance (ZO) Section 6.200 & 6.207). Specifically discuss which requirements are requested to be amended as part of the PRD overlay, address the PCD density criteria as outlined in ZO Section 6.208, Table 6.208.B. and the ESL density criteria (Table 6.1081.A).
 - a. **The Project Narrative has been revised as requested. The applicant is not requesting any amended standards as it relates to the proposed density of the Project as the base density of an R1-43 subdivision is one (1) unit per acre and we are proposing a density of 0.7 dwelling units per acre (21 units on the 29-acre site). Please refer to Pages 8 through 12 of the revised Project Narrative.**

Amended Development Standards:

2. The zoning district map amendment site plan is dependent upon the request for amended development standards as outlined in ZO Sections 6.1083.E.1. (ESL), 6.212, 6.205.A, 6.207, and 6.210 (PRD). Please address the following;
 - Within a revised narrative, please discuss the justifications for the proposed amended development standards and the square footage/percentage of excess NAOS dedication that will be located in Tracts in exchange of the amended standards.
 - **The Narrative has been revised as requested (see Page 8 through 13 of the revised Project Narrative). Currently the subdivision is providing 444,331 sf of total NAOS versus a total NAOS requirement of 442,393 (see the NAOS plan within the Pre-Plat Package). The total NAOS encompasses 39% of the total net project area.**
 - On a revised site plan, please provide a data table on a revised subdivision and site plan that outlines the development standards in comparison to the amended developments standards, and the allowable/provided reduction percentages of each standard.
 - **A table showing the requested amended development standards versus the base development standards (along with the % reductions) is shown on the cover sheet of the revised Pre-Plat Package.**
 - Within the next submittal, please revise the amended development standards to acknowledge Zoning Ordinance Section 6.210, building height shall not exceed one (1) story within fifty (50) feet of an R1-district boundary line.
 - **This comment has been added into the updated Amended Development Standards (see page 2 of the Amended Development Standards or Page 84 of the Project Narrative).**
 - Please provide a revised site plan that identifies and dimension the amended setbacks and lot width.
 - **A new page has been added to the Pre-Plat Package to include lot widths and amended setbacks as requested. Please see page 7 of the Pre-Plat Package.**
 - Demonstrate compliance with minimum lot width requirement for flag lots for ESL amended standards and/or within the definition of lot width (ZO Sec. 6.1083.E.8. and 3.100).
 - **Per ZO Sec. 6.108.E.8, the minimum lot width for flag lots will be 20'. All flag lots on the revised site plan are at least 20' wide. The dimensions of the flag lots can be found on Page 2 of the Pre-Plat Package.**

Site Plan and Preliminary Plat:

3. In accordance with Sec. 6.213.1, Where a PRD project abuts an R-1 district, the buildings on the PRD shall be setback from the perimeter property line a distance at least as much as the required rear yard setback of the adjacent district. Within the next submittal, please provide setback exhibit with an amended standards table.

- a. **The abutting zoning districts to our PRD request are R-190. The R-190 zoning district outlines a minimum 60' rear yard setback. As such, all homes built on the subject lots will be setback a minimum of 60' from the western and southern property lines (except for the existing house on lot 11, which will remain, and is setback 58'). A setback exhibit with an amended standards data table has been included on Page 1 of the Pre-Plat Package.**
4. Please clarify the zoning district map amendment request to Single-family Residential (R1-43, ESL as its confusing when the largest lot is under 35,000 square feet (ZO Section 5.204.A.1.).
 - a. **Our request to an R1-43 ESL zoning amendment versus a R1-35 ESL zoning amendment is due to the requested density of the Project (less than one (1) unit per acre). An R1-35 ESL zoning amendment would permit us to add more density to the site than we would like to request. We recognize the similarities of the two zoning districts; however, we believe the request for a R1-43 PRD ESL zoning designation, rather than a R1-35 PRD ESL zoning designation, is more compatible with the neighboring properties to the north, south, and west. While the R1-43 designation would allow for more homes than requested, the desire of the proposal is to limit the density. The R1-43 designation preserves a greater lot width after a 25% reduction. Additionally, it should be noted that the requested site plan includes no "On-Lot NAOS". The NAOS for this project is located in dedicated tracts and as such, the lot sizes will not be as large as they would typically be if we were to incorporate On-Lot NAOS into the site plan (See Page(s) 9 & 19 of the Project Narrative for additional clarification).**
5. Pursuant to ZO Section 6.1083.E.6, setbacks on the perimeter of a subdivision or land division shall be equal to or greater than the setbacks of the underlying zoning on adjacent parcels. Please provide a site plan with the required setbacks.
 - a. **The abutting zoning districts to our Project are R-190. The R-190 zoning district outlines a minimum 60' rear yard setback. As such, all homes built on the subject lots will be setback a minimum of 60' from the western and southern property lines (the only exception being the existing house on lot 11 (which will remain) which is currently setback 58' from the building to the perimeter property line). A setback exhibit with an amended standards data table has been included in this revised submittal (the setback exhibit is located on Page 7 of the Pre-Plat Package while the amended standards are noted on the cover page (Page 1 of the Pre-Plat Package)).**
6. According to Resolution No. 6716 and 1-GP-2004, East Happy Valley Road is designated as a Desert Scenic Roadway, which prohibits walls and other improvements. Please identify and dimensions the required setback 50-foot wide setback and eliminate the walls along East Happy Valley Road.
 - a. **The required 50-foot wide setback has been dimensioned on the updated site plan (Page 2 of the Pre-Plat Package). In regards to the perimeter sound walls along Happy Valley Road, and as outlined in multiple discussions with the Review Staff, due to the requested curvilinear wall design, there are two small encroachments of the wall into the 50-foot buffered roadway setback. The encroachments span from 1" to 29" for a total of 76' and another spans**

1" to 20" for a total of 48'. In all, these encroachments combine to be roughly 150 sq. feet in total. This small amount of encroachment is offset by the sections of the wall that expand the depth of the 50' buffered roadway setback by 4' to 6' in large stretches. In all, the expansion of the wall adds an additional +/- 1,000 sq. feet of land within the buffered roadway setback which more than covers the 150 sq. feet where we encroach into the setback. Additionally, it should be noted the applicant is dedicating 10' feet of ROW to the City as a requirement of this Project. If the applicant were to not provide this extra ROW dedication, there would be no encroachments into the 50-foot wide setback. As noted earlier as well, the purpose of this proposed sound wall is to (1) mitigate the visual and sound impacts of traffic along Happy Valley for our future residents and (2) to provide an aesthetically pleasing wall design by avoiding straight linear wall designs. An exhibit further outlining this request can be found on Page 7 of the Project Narrative and on Page 2 (Cross Section A) of the Wall & Hardscape Plan.

Wall Plan:

7. The intent of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands District is to protect and preserve significant natural and visual resources such as washes. Additionally, walls shall not enclose or disconnect contiguous NAOS and are not permitted to cross washed over fifty (50) cfs. Currently, the sound wall and other site walls are crossing washes. Please protect the existing washes by eliminating walls where they cross washes (ZO Section 6.1011.B.).
 - a. **In the previous submittal there was one (1) location where the perimeter wall was crossing the one (1) wash on site that is over fifty (50) cfs (along the northeastern portion of the site, just northeast from the front of Lot 21). This wall has been changed so as to leave a gap in the wall to allow the wash to freely flow during storm events. The gap is shown on Page 1 of the Wall & Hardscape Plan and is located just northeast of Lot 21.**
8. The maximum height of walls within the required side and rear yards are eight (8) feet or twelve feet subject to 20-foot setback. Please provide a dimensioned slump block wall detail specifically on lots 1,2,3 which appear to be located within the required setback.
 - a. **The slump block walls have been removed from Lots 1, 2, & 3 and have been placed in separate tracts (as shown on the Lot 1 / Tract Detail exhibit on Page 7 of the updated Pre-Plat package). As such, the setback criteria does not hold. As requested, an exhibit outlining the slump block perimeter wall detail has been included in this updated submittal and can be found on Page 4 of the Wall & Hardscape Plan.**
9. Where on-site walls are placed adjacent to NAOS areas at least fifty (50) percent of the wall surface shall be a view fence (DSPM Section 2-2.501.B.2.s). Please reference wall types on a wall plan and reference the appropriate detail. Please revise the slump block wall located on lots 1, 2, and 3 and provide a detail that show the wall at least fifty (50) percent as a view fence.

- a. An exhibit outlining the wall types has been included on the revised Wall & Hardscape Plan (Page 4). It should be noted that the individual lot walls are not included within this revised submittal and will not be submitted for approval until the lots have been purchased by 3rd-Party Buyers.**
 10. Please clarify the locations of the 6-foot tall slump accent wall located along East Happy Valley. It appears that a 9-foot wall is located along lots 1 and 2 and the remaining walls along lots 18-21 are 6 feet tall.
 - a. The Wall & Hardscape Plan has been revised to show the locations and projected heights of the perimeter walls only. The Wall & Hardscape Plan no longer includes any lot walls. The individual lot walls will be submitted with the plot plans after a home has been purchased by a 3rd-party buyer.**
 11. The Preliminary Plat references multiple retaining walls, please revise the wall plan to identify the locations of all retaining walls and provide dimensioned details that conform to the wall height requirements as outlined in ZO Section 5.034.G.
 - a. Within this revised submittal, the retaining walls have been removed from the Preliminary Plat and are only shown on the Grading plan. The retaining walls are preliminary and will be submitted for review and approval with the individual lot grading plans.**
- Please keynote the retaining walls located within the retention basin along lots 19-21 and provide a dimensioned retaining wall detail.

Within this revised submittal, the retaining walls have been removed from the Preliminary Plat and are only shown on the Grading plan. The retaining walls will conform to the DSPM, are preliminary, and will be submitted for review and approval with the individual lot grading plans. It should be noted that the applicant intends to provide terraced retaining walls in this section. The terraced retaining walls have been designed to include a large planter section allowing for the placement of trees (which necessitated the walls staying linear in this specific area). The applicant believes the ability to plant trees will screen the walls better than the curvilinear design. A cross section of the proposed terraced retaining walls is included as Exhibit A to this Response Letter for reference purposes.
 - Please clarify the grey line weight shown on the individual lot property line. Please confirm the on-lot wall detail conforms to the front yard wall height of three (3) feet. Please provide a 3-foot tall on-lot wall detail, an on-lot retaining wall detail and revise the wall plan accordingly.
 - a. Within this revised submittal, there are currently no on-lot walls shown. As noted above, the retaining walls are only shown on the revised Grading plan as a general placeholder as the detailed design of the retaining walls and related lot walls will be completed during the final engineering / final improvement plan phase of the Project. All lot walls will be submitted for review and approval with the individual lot grading plans.**

- The maximum height of a wall that combines a retaining wall and solid wall shall be 10 feet. Please terrace walls and use undulating or angular alignment for terrace walls greater than 50 feet in length (DSPM Section 2-2.405.B. and DSPM Figure 2-2.8).
 - a. **All wall combinations will conform to the DSPM. There are currently two areas on the revised site-plan that show combined walls that are greater than 50 feet in length: the site / sound mitigation wall located along the northern perimeter of the project (along the Happy Valley Road frontage) and the terraced retaining walls along the south side of lots 19-21. As noted above, the sound / perimeter wall located along the Happy Valley Road frontage will be curvilinear / undulating. The retaining walls along the south side of lots 19-21 will be terraced as to provide a small area of landscaping between the two walls (please see Exhibit A to the Response Letter for a cross-section of the proposed terraced retaining walls).**
- Please provide dimensioned detail of the double slump block wall located along lots 18-21.
 - a. **A detail of the wall located along the south side of lots 18-21 has been provided on the revised Wall & Hardscape Plan (see page 4) that is included in this resubmittal. Additionally, a cross section of the proposed terraced retaining walls is included as Exhibit A to this Response Letter for reference purposes.**
- Please note, as part of the Development Review Board application, please include the request for Development Review Board approval for a Sound-buffer Wall along East Happy Valley Road. The wall design shall incorporate rustic and dark materials, provide openings and breaks for washes and adjacent NAOS areas, and shall include variations in vertical and horizontal alignment (DSPM Section 2-2.501.B.5).
 - a. **Noted. The applicant will request DRB approval of the sound-buffer wall along East Happy Valley Road as part of its DRB application.**

Natural Area Open Space Plan:

12. Per ZO Section 6.1090 (ESL submittal requirements) and DSPM Section 2-2.404 (1), please submit a NAOS analysis plan that includes all civil improvements, proposed construction envelopes and man-made structures. Please confirm all man-made structures including drainage headwalls, retaining walls, rip-rap, and sidewalks (“access to wash”) etc. are not located with NAOS. Please revise the NAOS configuration and calculations accordingly.
 - a. **An updated NAOS plan with revised NAOS calculations has been included in this resubmittal (please see page 4 of the Pre-Plat Package).**
13. The minimum contiguous area for Natural Area Open Space is 4,000 square feet. Please demonstrate that the NAOS located within Tract B and between Lot 3 and the driveway entrance meets the minimum NAOS square footage (ZO Section 6.1060.F.1.a.).

- a. **The NAOS located within Tract B is 18,812 square feet. The NAOS located between Lot 3 and the driveway entrance is 7,780 square feet. Both of these calculations have been provided on the updated NAOS plan as requested (see Page 4 of the Pre-Plat package).**
14. Please clearly label the construction envelope on a revised NAOS and grading and drainage plan. Grading is allowed to occur only within an approved construction envelope and is not permitted within designated undisturbed Natura Area Open Space. DSPM Section 2-2.404, 2-1.1105 and Zoning Ordinance Figure 6.1070. (B).
 - a. **As discussed in our response to comment #4, due to there being no “On-Lot NAOS”, the construction envelopes are the boundaries of each individual lot. As such, the construction envelopes are the lot boundaries themselves.**

Native Plant:

15. Please revise the native plant plan and inventory to graphically depict a construction envelope and revise plant species to ‘remain in place’ (ZO Section 7.503.3).
 - a. **As discussed in our response to comment #4 & #14, due to there being no “On-Lot NAOS”, the construction envelopes are the boundaries of each individual lot. The Native Plant Plan currently shows that all plant species outside of the individual lot boundaries are to “remain in place” as requested.**

Engineering:

16. Off-site transportation, stormwater, and water resources improvements along property frontages to existing supporting infrastructure, with associated dedications are required. Please update the site plan accordingly (SRC 48-7, 47-10, 49-219).
 - a. **The site plan has been updated as requested. The additional ROW has been dedicated and the Preliminary Plat has been modified to facilitate the future round-about at the intersection of Happy Valley Rd and Alma School Rd. Alma School Road will be widened to 28’ back of curb to back of curb and the applicant will create a center crown for the street. Water and sewer are being installed along the Desert Vista Drive frontage along the south perimeter of the project (See Page 2 of the Pre-Plat Package).**
17. Please note, a covenant to construct and assurances for public infrastructure will be required prior to final plat recordation (SRC Ch 48).
 - a. **The applicant is aware of this requirement and will post the needed assurances as required prior to final plat recordation.**

Transportation:

18. Please dedicate the northern half of the cul-de-sac located on Desert Vista Drive in the southwestern portion of the site, 50-foot radius. DSPM Sec. 5-3.100; Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-10

- a. Pursuant to the applicant's discussions with both Traffic and Fire, this comment has been withdrawn and Traffic and Fire have both agreed to allow a 40.5' dedication of the northern half of the cul-de-sac located on Desert Vista Drive.
19. Please complete the local collector, Rural/ESL, street improvements along the North Alma School Road site frontage – DSPM Figure 5-3.15, 24' of pavement width, plus roll curb or ribbon curb. DSPM Sec. 5-3.100. Please provide a street cross section that identifies the improvements.
- a. The applicant will provide a 28' street section along the North Alma School frontage. A street cross section has been provided on the Grading and Drainage plan (page 3 of the Pre-Plat package) of this resubmittal.

Drainage:

20. Please refer to the redlined/marked up Preliminary Drainage Report (13-ZN-2019_V2_CORR-DRAINAGE-HV-18 - Drainage Report.pdf) and the Preliminary Civil G&D Plan (13-ZN-2019_V2_CORR-DRAINAGE-HV-18 - G&D Plan.pdf) for drainage review comments. Also, please refer to the 13-ZN-2019_V2_CORR-DRAINAGE-QS-SlopePercent.pdf file.
- a. All Drainage comments / redlines have been addressed as requested. See the revised Preliminary Drainage Report.

Water and Wastewater:

21. Please submit revised Water and Waste Water Design Reports and address the following:
- a. Construct an 8-inch waterline along southern boundary, East Desert Vista Drive frontage. An 8-inch line is required because Desert Vista Drive is a quarter-mile street (Sec.49-219).
 - a. An 8" waterline has been added within Desert Vista Drive.
 - b. In the final Water BOD Report and design, the piping system will be required to indicate the pipe segments that require thrust restraint and the method of thrust restraint. DSPM 6-1.411
 - a. The applicant is aware of this requirement.
 - c. The connection of the proposed/existing water main must be described whether it is a tee with isolation valves or a tap with isolation valves. Isolation valving is to be indicated on the proposed water main. DSPM 6-1.409
 - a. The connection of the proposed and existing water main will be a tee with isolation valves, as further described within the Water Basis of Design Report (See Page 3 of the Water BOD).

Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the second 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:

2001 General Plan Analysis:

22. Site Walls/ Sound walls are not permitted in the scenic corridor setback. (Pg. 15, of the Scenic Corridor Design Guidelines)
 - a. The second submittal has several graphics, (Figure 10, Page 35 of the narrative, Wall Plan, etc.) that appear to represent a curvilinear slump block wall within the Desert Scenic Roadway setback; it is unclear by the line weight of the stated wall if this was meant to be intentional or not. Please ensure with a resubmittal that this improvement is removed from the Desert Scenic Roadways setback.
 - i. **Please refer to the comments provided under comment #6 for a further explanation of the small perimeter wall encroachments into the Desert Scenic Roadway Setback.**
23. With a resubmittal, please also ensure that all graphics and narrative references, identify North Alma School Road, south of East Happy Valley Road, as a buffered roadway just as the 1st submittal did (This will not require any site plan modifications).
 - a. **As requested, North Alma School Road has been identified with a roadway landscape buffer, as shown on page 2 of the updated Pre-Plat package.**

Engineering:

24. Per DSPM Sections 5-3.107 & 5-3.110, please dedicate and construct two (2) travel lanes (one in each directions) and a minimum 6-foot wide sidewalk within project boundary, to include a 40-foot full street right-of-way and a 12-foot wide travel lane inclusive of ribbon/rolled curb. Please update the site plan accordingly
 - a. **The applicant intends to provide a 40-foot full street right-of-way with 14-foot travel lanes inclusive of the ribbon/rolled curb. Per an email with Eliana Hayes on 12/30/19, no internal sidewalk will be required based on DSPM's sidewalk exemption 5.3.110.C. being met.**
25. Per DSPM Sections 5-3.105, 5-3.110, along North Alma School Road which is designated as a Minor Collectors Rural ESL Character with Trails, please dedicate and construct a 30-foot half street right-of-way, one travel lane (in both directions), bike lane and a 6-foot minimum sidewalk to include: 13-foot-wide travel lane, 7-foot-wide bike lane (inclusive of ribbon/rolled curb) and raised median along projects eastern boundary. Please update the site plan with the required half street improvements, plan view and cross section.

- a. **Per discussions with City Staff, North Alma School is actually designated as a Local Collector, Rural/ESL, as mentioned in comment #19 of this letter. The road improvement will be consistent with what is required for a Local Collector, Rural/ESL.**

Transportation:

- 26. Please construct an 8-foot wide multi-use trail (non-paved) along the North Alma School Road and East Happy Valley Road frontages. Please identify and dimension a non-motorized public access easement to accommodate any portions of the trail that extend outside of the right-of-way. DSPM Sec. 8-3.200, Trail Classifications, 8-3.203; Ad Hoc Citizens Trails Task Force Final Report 2009. Please extend the trail along North Alma School Road to East Happy Valley Road.
 - a. **An 8-foot wide non-paved multi-use trail has been provided along the North Alma School and East Happy Valley Road frontages as requested. This trail is shown as the color light brown on the revised Wall & Hardscape Plan (see Page 1 of the Wall & Hardscape Plan). The applicant will provide a public-access easement to accommodate any small portions of the trail that extend outside of the ROW during the Platting process (and would like to be stipulated to provide this as such during the Zoning approval process).**
- 27. Please construct an 8-foot wide shared-use path (concrete) from Happy Valley Road to the subdivision entrance. DSPM Sec. 5-7.200, Facilities, 5-7.202.
 - a. **An 8-foot wide shared-use concrete path has been provided along the North Alma School Road frontage from the subdivision entrance to East Happy Valley Road. This concrete path is shown as the color blue on the revised Wall & Hardscape plan. It should be noted that there is a 230' area where the concrete path is combined with the 8' wide multi-use path (as mentioned in comment 26 above) due to steep slopes from the back of curb to the perimeter wall located just east of Lot 1.**

Technical Corrections

The following technical ordinance or policy related corrections have been identified in the second 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 Plans/Preliminary Plat:

- 28. On all plans, please identify and dimension existing and proposed easements and Tract and delineate with various line weights.
 - a. **The easements and tracts have been identified and delineated with different line weights as requested.**
- 29. The eastern property line on Lot 1 appears to be adjacent to the existing 50-foot wide North Alma School Right of way. Property lines adjacent to right of way result in a front yard. Please revise the plan to show a front yard setback.

- a. **The site plan has been revised as noted (see the Lot 1 / Tract C detail that is shown on Page 7 of the Pre-Plat package). There is a 2' tract of land (Tract C) located in between the North Alma school right of way and Lot 1.**

Preliminary Plat/Grading and Drainage Plan:

30. Please identify the subdivision sign and entry walls within a Tract.
 - a. **The subdivision entry walls and sign have been updated to be shown as located within Tract B (see the Sign / Entry Detail on Page 7 of the updated Pre-Plat package).**
31. Please identify and dimension all existing and proposed easements and/or Tracts along East Happy Valley Road.
 - a. **The easements and tracts have been identified along East Happy Valley Road on the revised Preliminary Plat & Grading and Drainage Plan. (Page 2 and 3 of the revised Pre-Plat package)**

Natural Area Open Space Plan:

32. Please identify and dimension all existing and proposed easements and Tracts on a revised NAOS plan.
 - a. **The easements and tracts have been identified on the revised NAOS plan (page 4 of the updated Pre-Plat package).**
33. Please provide the total square footage and acreage of NAOS that will be contained within a Tract.
 - a. **A tract table showing the total square footage and acreage of the NAOS within each tract is shown on the updated NAOS plan (page 4 of the updated Pre-Plat package).**

Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional/supplemental 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 the application is to be scheduled for a hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional/supplemental information is necessary. In an effort to get this Zoning District Map Amendment request to a Planning Commission hearing, please submit the revised material identified in Attachment A as soon as possible.

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 51 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to have the minimal information to be reviewed. These 2nd 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 480-312-4211 or at mtessier@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

EXHIBIT A

Cross Section of Terraced Retaining Walls Behind Lots 18-21

