

***** Camelot Responses to City Comments are shown in RED below each comment. This response letter is dated February 25, 2022. *****

The Planning & Development Services Division has completed the review of the above referenced development application submitted on 1/7/2022. 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:

General Plan, Character Area, Streetscape Adopted Plan Issues:

1. Please expand the responses to the 2035 General Plan and Dynamite Foothills Character Area goals and policies as opposed to the batched responses given.

EXAMPLE:

Character and Design Element

Policy- CD 5.2 To the greatest extent possible, replace dead and dying landscaping with drought resistant plants to maintain or improve density pattern, shade and area character.

Response: ...

- **The Narrative has been updated as requested. Please see pages 24 through 46 for the expanded responses to the 2035 GP and Dynamite Foothills Character Area goals and policies.**

2. The Circulation Element (Policies C5.5 and C8.1) along with the Dynamite Foothills Character Area Plan (Goal 1, Strategy 2) discuss the use of neighborhood appropriate design standards - such as the use of ribbon curbs and the trail along 128th Street. Please provide an updated G&D plan that shows the appropriate street section along with a revised narrative that describes how these Goals and Policies are being met.

The Narrative has been updated as requested. Please see pages 44 through 46 for the expanded responses to the Circulation Element of the Dynamite Foothills Character Area Plan and the associated incorporated design standards. Roll curb will be utilized throughout the project to ensure to control drainage and route runoff to the retention basins. Callouts have been added to the G&D plan.

3. The Dynamite Foothills Character Area Plan (Goal 3, Strategy 3) encourages the conservation of Rural Desert character – including the preservation of unique open spaces. With a resubmittal, respond the Plan's referenced policy both narratively, with a cuts/fills exhibit to ensure building envelopes are sensitive to the change in terrain on the site and graphically, identifying all significant environmental features, in this instance all

the boulder features that would be expected to be protected (i.e., Boulder Outcrop Easement) per Section 6.1070 of the city's Zoning Ordinance.

- **The Narrative has been updated as requested. Please see pages 44 through 46 for the expanded responses to the Open Space Element(s) of the Dynamite Foothills Character Area Plan and the associated incorporated design standards. A “cut and fills” exhibit outlining the proposed building envelopes (with callouts identifying boulders to remain) is included with this resubmittal.**
4. If further outreach has been conducted since the original submittal, and as a response to Goal CI 1 of the Community Involvement Element as well as Policy LU 3.5 of the Land Use 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 further updated Citizen Involvement Report has been included with this resubmittal (item #9)**
5. The Purpose of the Planned Residential Development Supplementary District discusses that the district may be utilized to develop a property that may be “difficult to develop under conventional zoning and subdivision regulations”. The narrative submitted did not provide detailed discussion related to this aspect of the PRD Purpose in the first submittal.
- **The applicant is not requesting a PRD overlay with this resubmittal. The requested rezone is now to R1-43 ESL (no PRD). The lots have been revised to meet the amended development standards, as such a PRD will not be necessary with this project.**

Zoning:

6. The narrative identifies that no additional density is being requested via the PRD, and the amendments to the development standards proposed appear to fall within the achievable reduction of 25% allowable using the ESL overlay (Sec. 6.1083) with the exception of a 50sqft difference in minimum lot area. Please verify and clarify the need to request the PRD overlay instead of just pursuing R1-43 ESL zoning for this project.
- **As noted above on our response to item #5, the applicant is not requesting a PRD overlay with this resubmittal. The requested rezone is now to R1-43 ESL (no PRD).**
7. The PRD overlay sets perimeter setback requirements in Sec. 6.213 of the Zoning Ordinance, which specify that 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 or perimeter setback of the adjacent district.
- The southern project boundary abuts existing R1-130 ESL zoning which would require a 60-foot rear yard setback be maintained for proposed Lots 14, 15, 16 and 18. Please demonstrate compliance with the perimeter setback requirements of the requested PRD and/or revise the lot configuration(s) accordingly.

- **Per conversation with Jeff Barnes, we will not be utilizing a PRD. Additionally, we will be maintaining an average of a 60' rear setback along the southern project boundary as well as a side setback of 30' for Lot 18. An updated "setback exhibit" showing how the site conforms to the perimeter setback requirements as noted above has been included with this resubmittal.**
8. Please verify and revise the NAOS configuration to ensure all areas are meeting the minimum dimensional parameters of Sec. 6.1060.F.1 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- **An updated "NAOS" exhibit that outlines the amount of NAOS included in the site plan vs. what is required per the Zoning ordinance is included with this resubmittal. We will be utilizing NAOS on adjacent projects to supply the additional required width. Adjacent NAOS has been added to our plan to show how the width requirements will be met.**

Circulation:

9. Please revise the site configuration to account for the dedication of 40-feet of fee title right-of-way along the 128th Street frontage. The provided only ALTA shows an existing 35-feet of right-of-way, but DSPM 5-3.100 and Scottsdale Revised Code Sec. 47-10 dictate 40-feet as the minimum to achieve the street designation cross-section.
- **The site plan has been updated to account for and annotate the 40' of fee title ROW along the 128th Street frontage.**

Drainage:

10. Please submit a revised Drainage Report addressing the comments below:

- In-line basins are discouraged by the DSPM 4-1.201, Section D.

While we are aware that the City discourages in-line detention within washes, there are very limited locations that a basin can be located in steep terrain such as with this project and still be effective. These locations were chosen based on the roadway prisms providing a practical location because of the cross culverts, while minimizing disturbances to the natural character of the area in order to grade in basins. As discussed, sediment accumulation should be made part of necessary maintenance for any drainage system like this. We do not believe that given the size and slope of the culverts passing beneath the roadways that sediment plugging or accumulation should occur. At the same time, sediment that collects upstream of the elevated drop inlets would presumably be removed as part of regularly scheduled maintenance by the owner.

As also discussed, we will make every effort to mitigate what occurs if the culverts plug and flows overtop the roadways. We will design adjacent finished floors to be above the emergency spillway function of the roadways.

- Please illustrate that pre vs. post calculations/analysis will be met. The current proposed basin layout and size doesn't appear to meet the requirement.

Based on the current proposed layout, the pre-vs-post requirement is met for all Site outfalls for the 100-year and 10-year storm frequencies. There is one outfall which does not meet the requirement for the 2-year storm frequency (CEDA-8). However, the outfall mentioned above shows an increase in flow of 1 cfs which is within the level of accuracy for this analysis and should be considered incidental and in conformance with the design requirements.

- Basin side slopes shall not exceed 4:1, verify that the current side slopes meet DSPM guidelines.

All graded basin side slopes are graded to a maximum of 4:1. Note that some un-graded basin side slopes are comprised of natural terrain which may exceed 4:1. Please see the Grading and Drainage Plan included with this submittal.

- First flush is not met based on analysis in the drainage report, the outlet pipes are set to the bottom of the basins.

The outlet pipes are set to the basin invert elevations. However, the outlet pipes drain from the invert of elevated drop inlets. The basins do not discharge until the headwater exceeds the crest of the weir at the top of the drop inlets. In basin SDA-2, there is 3 feet between the bottom of the basin (2675') and the crest of the weir (2678'). In basin SDA-5, there is 2 feet between the bottom of the basin (2685') and the crest of the weir (2687').

The static storage below the crest of the drop inlets is where first-flush storage is achieved. This volume will bleed off through an orifice in the drop inlet wall in less than 36 hours.

- Analyze the broken-back culverts in HY-8 and not in StormCAD. Use StormCAD for only storm drains. The inlet and outlet control hydraulics need to be computed for the culvert.

Systems that feature a culvert inlet configuration and has no intermittent introduction of flows at transitions are analyzed in HY-8. Those systems that have in-line catch basins, are excessively flat in slope, and/or have deflection angles beyond those that would be reasonably negligible in a culvert calculation will be analyzed in StormCAD. The hydraulic calculations for systems "Storm G" and "Storm H" have been re-created using HY-8.

- Include an exhibit in the drainage report for the onsite drainage to clearly show the contributing area for each catch basin and detention basins.

The proposed onsite drainage patterns are shown on the Drainage Map in Appendix 3. The scale of the map has been adjusted and additional flow direction arrows have been added to provide better clarity of the proposed onsite drainage patterns. In

addition, relevant HEC-1 station labels have been included to clarify which drainage areas contribute to each structure. For pavement drainage capacity calculations (street capacity, catch basins) we will include a Rational method estimate of flows incident to those structures in the final design stages.

- Expand the existing conditions exhibit/model to show DBE17B and the upstream area for DBE17A. Currently the offsite and onsite exhibits have the same extents and perhaps it should be different to clearly show the offsite flows contributing to the site.

Two exhibits have been added to the Existing Hydrology and Proposed Hydrology exhibits which both show the offsite areas from the Sereno Canyon and Shadow Ridge (Astoria Highlands). It should be noted that the offsite areas and structures that are associated with the approved Sereno Canyon Phase 3A and Shadow Ridge Drainage Reports are not available in CAD format. The areas have been approximated based on the provided referenced documents. Please see the referenced drainage schematics from Sereno Canyon Phase 3A and Shadow Ridge provided in Appendix 6 to see the offsite drainage design

HEC-1 Model

- For the existing conditions model, the Desert land use parameters used are based on NDR defaults from DDMSW. The project is mostly steeper than 5%, perhaps use the NHS or justify the use of NDR.

The Desert land use parameter has been updated to be based on the NHS defaults. The updated HEC-1 Model is provided in Appendix 2.

Routing reaches Manning's n-value of 0.060 is too high and doesn't reflect the site conditions. Review and revise or explain.

The Manning's n-value has been revised to be 0.035 within the channel and 0.050 on the overbanks to be consistent with the Manning's n-values used in the HEC-RAS Model.

Include excerpts from DDMSW to show the input data and output (i.e. Green & Ampt parameters, TC, R, etc.)

The HEC-1 analysis was only partially completed using DDMSW, as discussed in Section 5.3 of the preliminary drainage report. The HEC-1 data input files were manually adjusted to include the Sereno Canyon Phase 3A Drainage Report and the Astoria Highlands Drainage Report and therefore the DDMSW output will not correlate with the HEC-1 output. The DDMSW input summaries have been included with this submittal. The DDMSW summaries substantiate the onsite hydrology only.

SDA-5 basin rating doesn't match basin design HW in G&D.

The weir crest shown in the Drainage Plan exhibit and G&D plans was incorrectly labeled as 2678'. The design weir crest is 2688'. Both the Drainage Plan exhibit and G&D plans have been revised.

- **A revised drainage report that address the above comments is included with this resubmittal.**

Water and Wastewater:

11. Please submit revised Water and Wastewater Design Report(s) addressing the document mark-ups and the comments below:
 - Include a discussion of the existing topography, etc. per DSPM 6-1.202.E and 7-1.202.
 - Include a discussion of the need to cross the 50 CFS wash with the waterline.
 - Fire flow requirement is 500 GPM for homes with fire sprinklers.
 - Minimum average day pressure is 50 PSI per DSPM 6-1.403.
 - Evaluate existing capacity of the 128th Street sewer to LS-52. Estimate existing flows and calculate d/D per DSPM 7-1.404.
 - Static pressure is low compared to other pressure measurements in the area. HGL in Pressure zone 12E should be approximately 2812 ft. Coordinate fire flow test with City staff to be sure PRV fully opens.
- **Revised BOD reports for both Water and Wastewater, that address the comments noted above, are included with this resubmittal. Per our conversation with Scott Anderson, the water and sewer BOD's will be approved with stipulations.**

Significant Policy Related Issues

The following policy related issues have been identified in the first review of this application. While these issues may not be critical to scheduling the application for public hearing, they may affect the City Staff's recommendation pertaining to the application and should be addressed with the resubmittal of the revised application material. Please address the following:

Circulation:

12. Please revise the plans to provide minimum 6-foot-wide compacted shoulders along both sides of all internal streets.
 - **The Site Plan has been updated to include the required minimum 6' wide compacted shoulders on both sides of the internal streets.**
13. The proposed development configuration is inconsistent with the existing Local Area Infrastructure Plan (LAIP) for Dynamite Foothills Areas 5a & 5b. This rezoning submittal will need to include a request to modify those two LAIPs to align with the proposed subdivision layout and the remaining configuration of the parcels to the south, accessing from Alameda Road.

- **As required, included with this rezoning submittal is a request to modify the LAIP for Dynamite Foothills Areas 5a & 5b (items #5a & 5b).**
14. Recorded plat map (MCR 900-43) shows a 25-foot-wide public trail easement along 128th Street that is not shown or accounted for on the site plan or plat. Please address that easement with the resubmittal materials.
- **The updated Site Plan included with this resubmittal shows the 25' wide public trail easement along 128th Street.**
15. Please indicate what type of curb is proposed for the internal streets. The one-way entry drives must have 20-feet of drivable surface; 21-feet to B/C only works if this is mountable curb.
- **Curb type has been included on the plans.**
16. Please provide more detail for the trail crossing of the entry street.
- **Ramps have been added at the trail crossing along 128th Street**
17. Please provide verification that the 128th Street improvements have been completed along the site frontage, including the trail that is called out as existing.
- **Trail callout has been provided, 128th street improvements have been completed.**

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:

Final Plat:

18. The submittal of associated Abandonment application 1-AB-2022 will need to be completed, approved through the City Council process, and recorded before the final plat recordation for the proposed subdivision will be able to occur.
- **The applicant is aware that the requested / required Abandonment Application (1-AB-2022) will need to be completed through the City Council prior to the recordation of the Final Plat.**
19. Covenant to construct agreement and assurances for public infrastructure will be required prior to final plat recordation.
- **The applicant is aware of this requirement.**
20. The release of any existing easements in conflict with proposed development will need to be completed prior to or with the final plat.
- **The applicant is aware that any existing easements that are in conflict with the proposed development will be released via the recordation of the subject Final Plat.**











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.

The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 19 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).

Resubmittal Documents

-  (1) Shadow Ridge North 1st review comments (Response Letter)
-  (2) SNR Zoning Application Narrative 022822
-  (3,4) Shadow Ridge North Preliminary Plat (w NAOS Plan)
-  (5a) LAIP Modification - DynamiteFoothills5a
-  (5b) LAIP Modification - DynamiteFoothills5b
-  (6) 0032746.00 Preliminary Drainage Report
-  (6) R0032746.00 Working Proposed Hydrology-Drainage Plan
-  (7) Shadow Ridge North Water Report
-  (8) Shadow Ridge North Wastewater Report
-  (9) Camelot SRN Outreach Report February 2022