



April 1, 2015

George Burton
Planner
Town of Paradise Valley
6401 E Lincoln Drive
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Jason Morris
Withey Morris PLC
2525 E. Arizona Biltmore Circle, Suite A-212
Phoenix, AZ 85253

RE: Pre-Application review for Ritz Carlton new development plan

Dear Mr. Morris:

Staff's review of your pre-application identified that additional information and narrative clarification is needed in order to fully evaluate the request and prepare it for formal application submittal. Please note that this is only a cursory review and additional revisions or information may be required based upon a complete submittal. The items listed below may be addressed via an expanded narrative and updated master plan.

1. Master Plan:

- a. Typically, a detailed site plan accompanies a Special Use Permit (SUP) application. At this stage, a fully dimensioned detailed site plan is not required. However, the submitted master site plan requires more detail to help illustrate the density of the proposed improvements such as:
 - i. The major circulation pattern.
 - ii. An approximate percentage and type of public and private open space/amenity areas.
 - iii. The approximate lot sizes for the various housing products.
 - iv. The general location of different uses and building forms/types for all proposed areas (e.g. identify if the buildings will meet the recommended setbacks outlined in the SUP Guidelines, etc.).
- b. Identify the proposed use(s) for the parcel located in the City of Scottsdale.
- c. Identify the primary access location/entrance to the resort (e.g. Lincoln Dr. or Scottsdale Rd.).
- d. Identify if the Lincoln Drive access will have a traffic signal.
- e. The 25' landscape buffers along Lincoln Dr., Mockingbird Ln., and Indian Bend Rd. are not compliant with the SUP Guidelines. Staff believes that the housing product on the perimeter of the property should have a larger

landscape buffer in accordance with the SUP Guidelines. Please address why the 25' landscape buffer is appropriate.

- f. The master plan identifies two Area B's and three Area A's. Please provide a more detailed breakdown of each area (e.g. Area A1, A2, A3, B1, B2, C, D and E with an updated 2015 Proposed Overview Chart).
2. Density:
 - a. The proposed density seems high, particularly in Areas B and C along the western portion of the site. The General Plan designates a large portion of the western area of the site as Private Open Space or Resort/County Club. The expectation is these areas would provide more open space. This open space may be any combination of paths, parks, retention basins, large street setbacks like the Judson development on Mockingbird Lane, large lots, or by some other means. Also, the total site density is unknown since the density in Areas D and E is not provided. The next submittal should better explain/depict the proposed density.
 - b. In order to provide a sense of scale, please compare the proposed density of this project with other built projects.
 3. Heights:
 - a. Provide site lines and graphics for all areas.
 - b. Please identify why the heights deviate from the recommended heights outlined in the SUP Guidelines. The SUP Guidelines recommend a maximum height of 36' tall for principal structures, 24' for accessory structures and 18' for service structures.
 - c. Please identify if the proposed improvements will comply with the Open Space Criteria (as outlined in the SUP Guidelines). If they do not meet the Open Space Criteria height limitation, identify which areas will encroach and explain why the additional height is needed and is appropriate.
 - d. Identify how all heights will affect neighboring properties (e.g. will the improvements obstruct the neighbor's views).
 - e. Identify where the heights are measured from (e.g. lowest natural grade, finished floor, finished grade, etc.).
 - f. Provide a break-down of the various heights by type of building/resort use.
 - g. Provide design options that identify or illustrate how the design of the improvements will transition in height from the Spectrum and the apartment building located in the City of Scottsdale.
 4. Provide more information and detail regarding the drainage, traffic and parking associated with the proposed development:
 - a. Identify the general drainage patterns and drainage standards for the site (e.g. that the development will be designed in accordance with the 100 year - 2 hour storm event standards, etc.).
 - b. Identify if you are anticipating modifying the wash and how it will connect to the box culvert located in Scottsdale.
 - c. Discuss the anticipated traffic that will be generated from the development and the associated parking needed to accommodate the guests and traffic.
 - d. Identify what streets will be public/private.
 5. The narrative indicates that the number of homes is decreasing from the 2008 approval with this proposal; however, it appears that the number of homes may be increasing when you include the proposed 80 villas and the improvements in Areas D and E. Please update accordingly.

6. Please provide more detail regarding the resort villas (e.g. identify their uses, address the ownership of the villas and if they will be available for rent, etc.).
7. Provide more information and detail regarding the resort and retail/commercial uses.
8. Address and incorporate the comments that were outlined in the February 12, 2015 Community Conversation/Meeting into the narrative.
9. Address the assured water supply and sewer service (e.g. will the sewer connect and flow to the sewer line located in Indian Bend Rd., etc.).
10. Identify how the property/development will incorporate bicycle and pedestrian access. There is concern about possible conflicts if the green belt shown on the master plan will function as both a drainage way and bicycle/pedestrian access way.
11. Lincoln Drive is designated as a gateway in the Town's General Plan. Please provide a general description of how the proposed improvements and entrance along Lincoln Drive will reflect the gateway status (e.g. use of decorative elements such as landscaping and hardscape to enhance the sense of entry into the Town and resort).
12. Identify the minimum setbacks for Areas B, C and D and explain how the development along the perimeter will preserve open space and maintain view corridors.
13. Future submittal requirement for Planning Commission review:
 - a. Cross section of the adjoining rights-of-way should be in accordance with Figure 4.2 of the Town's General Plan.
 - b. A circulation plan that includes emergency access will be required.

This was only a cursory review and additional revisions or information may be required based upon the complete submittal. Please provide seven (7) copies of the updated plans and documents for staff review. If you have any questions, or would like to schedule a meeting, please contact me at (480) 348-3525.

Sincerely,

George Burton

George Burton
Planner