



Correspondence Between Staff and Applicant

Approval Letter

Denial Letter



CERTIFICATE OF NO EFFECT ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3-PP-2018

Hanella Estates

APPLICATION INFORMATION

LOCATION: 12481 East Shea Boulevard

PARCEL: 217-32-016

Q.S.: 28-58

APPLICANT: Jorge Villasenor

COMPANY: Jorge Villasenor

ADDRESS: 2045 South Vineyard

Suite 101

Mesa, AZ 85210

PHONE: 480-503-2250

Request approval of the preliminary plat for a 4-lot residential subdivision with amended development standards for reductions of lot area, lot width, front, side, and rear yard setbacks, including a construction envelope plan, preliminary grading and drainage plan, and a utility plan, all on a 4.5-acre site.

Certificate of No Effect-Archaeological Resources Criteria:

In accordance with Chapter 46, Article VI, of the Scottsdale Revised City Code, the City Archaeologist finds that:

- No archaeological resources are located on the property according to the archaeological survey and report and based upon review of the report by the City Archaeologist.

STIPULATIONS

1. Any development on the property is subject to the requirements of Scottsdale Revised Code, Chapter 46, Article VI, Protection of Archaeological Resources, Section 46-134 - Discoveries of archaeological resources during construction.

SIGNATURE:

Jeff Barnes, 480-312-2376

DATE:

1/10/2019

Planning and Development Services

7447 E Indian School Road Suite 105, Scottsdale, AZ 85251 Phone: 480-312-7000 Fax: 480-312-7088

City of Scottsdale's Website: www.scottsdaleaz.gov

To: *City of Scottsdale Planning & Development*
Jeff Barnes, Senior Planner
7447 E. Indian School Rd.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

From: *Brian Nicholls*
EPS Group, Inc.
1130 N Alma School Rd., Ste 120
Mesa, AZ 85201

Date: *February 19, 2021*

Re: ***Hanella Estates***
3-PP-2018
5th Review Comments
Response to Comments

Dear Mr. Barnes,

Per your request, we are providing the following responses to your 5th review comments dated 3/4/2020 of the above referenced project.

1. There appears to be a tough angle created by bringing the line across lot 3 to head north along the trail easement. You may have already ruled it out, but our recommendation would be to look at the alternative of bringing the lines along the cul-de-sac frontages of Lots 2 & 3 and then heading north along the boundary between Lots 3 & 4. This would require a 20-foot easement width for maintenance access, but might create less concerning bends along the route to Shea Blvd.

Response: The development team would like to keep the lines where they are, as it provides the best crossing of the wash and also provides the best access to the lines in the future. The project engineer will be detailed on the final improvement plans to identify how this works. Additionally, the developer wants to keep this at the back of the lots and way from the public right of way in order to ensure that it is clear that it is a private facility and away from the street.

2. We would also be looking for some declaration by the plat of a common responsibility (HOA) of the private sewer easement. If you can go the route between Lot 3 & 4, there may be opportunity to locate that within a tract for private sewer purposes if that is preferable to your layout or the common responsibility.

Response: A declaration is provided with this submittal.



4/23/2019

Jorge Villasenor
2045 S. Vineyard Ste 101
Mesa, AZ 85210

RE: 3-PP-2018
Hanella Estates

Dear Mr. Villasenor:

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 4/1/2019. The following **4th 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 third 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 original NAOS distribution provided 41% of the site as NAOS, but now still only provides 28% and proposes zero NAOS on Lot 1. The provided narrative does not give much detail explaining how the proposed 3% increase in NAOS is justifying the full use of amended development standards and NAOS redistribution amongst the lots. Please keep in mind that the proposed configuration of 4 lots on this site would not be possible without the use of those provisions.
 - a. The plans provided show the NAOS stopping about 50-feet short of the drainage easement limits and the proposed cut-off wall. Please look at utilizing this area as additional NAOS (approximately 15,000 square feet) to help justify the request increasing the total NAOS percentage to approximately 36% and preserving the entire wash limits as open space.

Drainage:

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

Significant Policy Related Issues

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

Engineering:

3. Please revise the plan to accurately show the dedication of a 13-foot wide PNMAE beyond the 20-foot wide ROW dedication for the north half of E. Cochise Drive. It is currently shown as 33-feet originating at the center line of the ROW.
4. Please clearly identify the East Cochise Drive half street improvements along the frontage including tapers to the existing pavement to the east and west of the frontage per DSPM Section 5-3.400. The improvements shown should follow the street section per DSPM Figure 5-3.19 showing the ribbon curb and sidewalk per that section.
 - a. Please revise the plan to show the improvements along the entire frontage, 11-feet of pavement north of the monument line, with tapers east and west of the subject parcel boundaries.
5. Water and Wastewater Basis of Design Reports must be submitted and approved by the Water Resources Department prior to submittal of improvement plans per DSPM Section 6 and 7.
6. Per Maricopa County Environmental Services, for individual on lot septic systems the lot must have a minimum of 1 acre. Lot 1 is under one (1) acre and approval of the on lot septic system from Maricopa County Environmental Services is required prior to the approval of the preliminary plat. Per staff conversations with the County's environmental health supervisor, both the City and County staff have concerns with the viability of creating 4-lots without sewer service connections.
 - a. Please revise the plans to identify the proposed building pads and illustrate anticipated septic system locations with associated setback requirements (to walls, structures, pools, easements, washes etc.) to clearly identify that with the proposal of 4-lots there is sufficient area available for septic system installations. Without this information, staff cannot recommend approval of this preliminary plat application.
 - b. If the result is that there is insufficient room to accommodate septic systems, the solution may be reducing the number of lots or extending a sewer connection to the subdivision.

Technical Corrections

The following technical ordinance or policy related corrections have been identified in the third 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:

7. Please revise the plans to reflect the existing trail improvements along the west side of the property.

Water:

8. Please provide a Hydrant Flow Test with the resubmittal.

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 the application is to be scheduled for a hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or additional information is necessary.

PLEASE CALL 480-312-7767 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 71 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to be administratively complete.

These **4th 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 480-312-2376 or at jbarnes@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

Sincerely,



Jeff Barnes
Senior Planner

ATTACHMENT A
Resubmittal Checklist

Case Number: 3-PP-2018

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

Digital submittals shall include one copy of each item identified below.

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

☒ One copy: Revised CD of submittal (CD/DVD, PDF format)

☒ Four copies: Revised Narrative for Project

☒ Preliminary Plat:

6 24" x 36" 1 11" x 17" 1 8 ½" x 11"

Technical Reports:

☒ 2 copies of Revised Drainage Report:

Resubmit the revised Drainage Reports, Water and Waste Water Report and/or Storm Water Waiver application to your Project Coordinator with any prior City mark-up documents.

Digital resubmittals of the Technical Reports can be submitted electronically by accessing the City's file drop system via the link below:

<https://securemail.scottsdaleaz.gov/filedrop/projectinput@scottsdaleaz.gov/>

From: judithterrill@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 3:53 PM
To: Barton, Wayland
Subject: 3-PP-2018



3-PP-2018 HANELLA ESTATES Please explain why this land is environmentally sensitive. Thank you. Judith Breuer judithterrill@gmail.com -- sent by Judith Breuer (case# 3-PP-2018)



© 2018 City of Scottsdale. All Rights Reserved.