



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Tuesday, July 7, 2015

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Strom called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Chairperson Dolf Strom, Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell, Commissioner Scott Moore, Commissioner Daran Wastchak and Commissioner Jeff Wincel

Absent 2 - Commissioner Richard K. Mahrle and Commissioner Jonathan Wainwright

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

There was no executive session called

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. [15-107](#) Consideration of a minor amendment to the Phoenix Country Day School Special Use Permit (SUP 15-02) to allow for various signs located on or near the aquatic center and gymnasiums. Some of these signs are to be illuminated by ground-mounted up lighting or back lighting. The subject property is located at 3901 E Stanford Drive (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 170-09-001A and 170-09-001B).

Paul Michaud presented the request per the application packet.

Planning Commission discussion included the following points:

- Chairman Strom asked about timing of the lights on the signs. Jordan Rose, attorney with Rose Law Group representing the school, clarified that the lights will be on a timer and they would be seasonally adjusted
- Chairman Strom asked about the photometric rule and what would happen if the school wanted to change out an approved light fixture in the future. Eva Cutro identified staff would evaluate if the modified light is substantially compliant or if it would need a managerial amendment to the school's Special Use Permit.
- Paul Michaud asked for clarification on whether the Planning Commission desired to require the gymnasium building sign or other signs with this application as part of the three allowable signs in the existing Special Use Permit. He noted that the existing

stipulation referred to monument signs at entry points along the street approved in 1985, of which two such signs were removed many years back. Commissioner Campbell expressed a desire not to be bound by the 1985 stipulation and the possibility of a future need on Stanford Drive. The Commissioners were agreeable to clarify that the proposed signage with this application should not impact the approved number of monument signs in 1985.

Public comment included the following:

- Jane Grace, who lives across the school along 40th Street, requested more information on the direction the signs will face and visibility of the sign illumination. Nick Labadie, planner with Rose Law Group, clarified the location of the signs. Mrs. Grace requested the Planning Commission restrict the sign illumination to be turned off at 8:30 p.m. instead of 9:30 p.m. It was stated that the 9:30 p.m. time was consistent with the exterior light shut off of the aquatic center.
- Barbara Moody, who lives across the school along 40th Street, stated she was disappointed with the look of the new gym, the color and its impact on views of sunsets. She noted she did not receive a mailing notification. It was pointed out that notice may have been returned by the post office. She expressed concern over the sign illumination. Jordan Rose stated she will coordinate with Mrs. Moody on meeting with her after the meeting to go over the items, as many of the points raised do not address the application before the Planning Commission this evening.

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Wastchak, to deem the requested amendment to the Phoenix Country Day School Special Use Permit as a minor amendment per the criteria listed in Section 1102.7.B of the Zoning Ordinance. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Chairperson Strom, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Moore, Commissioner Wastchak and Commissioner Wincel

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Mahrle and Commissioner Wainwright

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Wastchak, to approve the application subject to the stipulations in the action report and one added stipulation that this approval does not impact the existing SUP Stipulation regarding the three allowable signs approved in 1985. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Chairperson Strom, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Moore, Commissioner Wastchak and Commissioner Wincel

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Mahrle and Commissioner Wainwright

5. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

- A. [15-111](#) Work Study Session - Special Use Permit Major Amendment
Ritz-Carlton Paradise Valley
7000 E Lincoln Drive (SUP-15-01)

Chairman Strom provided some background on the project and introduced this work study session topic.

Eva Cutro stated staff has no formal presentation. She added that the applicant provided no material ahead of time for the Planning Commission packet for this meeting for staff to review.

Richard Frazee, project manager for the applicant, reviewed the three points the applicant team will cover this evening: traffic, parking and perimeter setbacks.

Traffic

Dawn Cartier with Civtec provided an overview of the traffic study. It was noted that this draft study was previously submitted to Town's third party reviewer. The third party reviewer did have comments. These comments included that the study consider the impact of special events and crash data.

Points discussed included the following:

- The roadway access onto Lincoln Drive in Area D located adjacent to the Town limits will be removed, leaving only one road access point onto Lincoln Drive into the project within the Town. Also, it was pointed out that the round-a-bout on Indian Bend Road is proposed to remain in its present location.
- Dawn Cartier stated that the background data described in the traffic study incorporates the proposed retail/hotel component of the project located in the City of Scottsdale. However, it was noted that since this Scottsdale piece of the project is not yet approved, the traffic study may need to be updated at a later date.
- Dawn Cartier provided an overview of the internal circulation, including the various access points to the underground garages. She noted that there will be a self-park option in the retail component of Area E, but for the most part the parking is all valet.
- Questions regarding traffic mitigation should there be an unexpected amount of vehicular traffic using the main road from Lincoln Drive to Indian Bend Road were discussed.
 - Commissioner Campbell stated the traffic study should incorporate cut-through traffic and not underestimate how

people will avoid making a left turn onto Lincoln Drive. Several points were brought up. This includes that the traffic study was conservatively based on the worst-case scenarios. It was noted that the traffic numbers included the proposed grocery store traffic. Dawn Cartier displayed the portion of vehicle trips at each intersection contributable to the resort, residential, and retail uses.

- Dawn Cartier described the design of the roadway as one lane in each direction, explained there will be turn lanes on the project roads that exit onto the perimeter roads, stated the project roads will have a low posted speed limit, and explained how the roadway design for the connection roadway between Area A and A1 will work. She described other aspects of the roadway design that will mitigate traffic congestion such as how the different mix of uses (i.e., hotel, residential, and retail) will use the roadways at different times and that the 'Y' roadway connection between the resort and Area E will not be used by the valet service. The valet service has its own access within the project site. She added that traffic engineers prefer to have traffic equalize across the roadway system.
- Questions arose regarding the type and timing of roadway improvements, including:
 - *Responsible Party*. Commissioner Wastchak asked who will pay and for what roadway improvements. It was stated that the necessary half-street improvements, to include landscaped medians, is part of the off-site improvements required to be constructed and paid for by the applicant. A dialogue ensued regarding the General Plan roadway cross-sections and how the adjoining public perimeter roads presently meet or do not meet these General Plan standards. Lincoln Drive is the only perimeter road requiring additional right-of-way. All three perimeter roads will require some level of improvements for bicycle lanes and/or sidewalks. Jim Shano further explained that roadway improvements on the opposite side of the perimeter roadways may require collecting money from the applicant for their portion of improvements until such time as the Town has the capital improvement funds to make the full roadway improvements. It was stated that the type and manner of improvements will be detailed in a development agreement or Town Council stipulation. However, the Planning Commission can make a recommendation to Town Council.
 - *Deceleration lanes*. The new access onto Lincoln Drive across from Quail Run Road will include a deceleration lane.

There is an option for a deceleration lane on Lincoln Drive turning north onto Mockingbird Lane, which the Town Engineer stated he would encourage. The applicant also suggested an optional deceleration lane southbound on Mockingbird Lane which would require additional land from the adjoining residential property owner. Most Commissioners seemed to think the southbound Mockingbird deceleration lane was not needed.

- *Sidewalks.* Eva Cutro read into the record a comment from a resident who wants the asphalt walkway along Lincoln Drive to be upgraded.
- *Timing.* Dawn Cartier explained that traffic signal at Lincoln Drive and Quail Run Road will go in when the resort goes in. She stated this will help with event traffic. She discussed signal timing strategies.
- Dawn Cartier reviewed graphics showing the used and available roadway capacity at various intersections. These graphics illustrate the amount of additional traffic due to the project from what currently exists to what is expected to exist in the year 2038. Highlights noted included:
 - The roadway segment on Scottsdale Road between Lincoln Drive and Indian Bend Road has higher than average traffic. This is possibly due to traffic from Lincoln Drive trying to get to Indian Bend Road in order to get to 101 Freeway.
 - The traffic flow at the intersection on Scottsdale Road and Indian Bend Road will flow better with the half street improvements completed on Indian Bend Road. These improvements will likely mirror the improvements on east side of Scottsdale Road and allow for synchronized light timing at this intersection.
 - The Tatum Boulevard and Lincoln Drive intersection has higher than average traffic. Some reasons for this include the lack of north-south commuter streets between Scottsdale Road and the 51 Freeway and restrictions along Tatum Boulevard to add travel lanes.
- Dawn discussed intersection level of service ratings.
- Concluding remarks on the traffic presentation included:
 - Chairman Strom asked the applicant to provide a future slide on the list of assumptions that went into the study.
 - Staff pointed out that compliance to the Statement of Direction regarding the review of a traffic study will be met once the Town Engineer approves the final report provided by CivTech and the third party reviewer. Dawn Cartier expects the final study to be submitted to the Town within a week or so.

- Staff will provide the Planning Commission a chart to track progress status of with the Statement of Direction items.
- At this time, the Planning Commission is agreeable to the traffic impact explanations.

Parking

The discussion moved to parking at 7:35 p.m.

- Dawn Cartier provided an overview of the original 2008 parking study and parking for the proposed development. She noted that the parking study is underway, but not completed and submitted to the Town. Richard Frazee noted that there are approximately 4,000 proposed parking spaces. Dawn stated the parking study addresses Special Use Permit Guidelines and items such as internal capture, uses and shared times of day.
- Other points raised included:
 - How the study factored in other resorts and which minimum thresholds create problems.
 - The need to address shared parking for events, particularly between the resort and Scottsdale portion of the project.
 - Chair Strom asked for Dawn Cartier to provide some history and track record regarding her past parking studies (e.g. Montelucia, Sanctuary).
 - To explain how the interconnectivity will work for the underground garages.

Perimeter Setbacks

The discussion moved to perimeter setbacks at 7:45 p.m.

Richard Frazee reviewed the slides showing various roadway cross sections taken through the perimeter streets from the centerline to the proposed perimeter project wall. He noted that the proposed landscape setback across from the Judson development was reviewed by the Judson homeowner association.

The primary take away points of this discussion were as follows:

- The applicant asked the Planning Commission to consider the landscape setback as the back of curb to the proposed perimeter project wall, as this is what a person will experience in viewing the site. It was noted that the Town measures setbacks from the property line. Also, that the visuals shown generally do not include additional roadway improvements such as any future lane widening, deceleration lanes, or required widening for bicycle lanes. Chairman Strom stated he could consider a greater setback of the perimeter wall from the street with a possible reduction in individual lot rear

setback. However, after all the discussion on this point, the Commissioners expressed that the applicant should at least meet the minimum width regarding the landscape guidelines as a means to provide flexibility on the interior of the project. As such, only roadway cross-section A-A at the relocated wash was agreeable by the Planning Commission. Eva Cutro reminded the Planning Commission that the goal should be to strive for more than the minimum, not something less than the minimum.

- *Indian Bend Road.* Indian Bend Road has a right-of-way width of 80 feet, which is greater than the Town's General Plan minimum width of 60 feet. The landscape setback on the eastern two-thirds of Indian Bend Road exceeds the Special Use Permit (SUP) Guideline setback of 30 feet. It is 80 feet due to the proposed relocated wash. However, the landscape setback along the western one-third of Indian Bend Road is 25 feet, which is five feet less than the SUP guideline. The cross sections shown had the proposed landscape setback, as measured from back of curb to the project perimeter wall, at 103 feet and 48 feet.
- *Mockingbird Lane.* Mockingbird Lane has a right-of-way width of 80 feet, which is the Town's General Plan minimum width. The project landscape setback on the majority of this road is five feet less than the SUP guideline of 50 feet. The cross sections shown had the proposed landscape setback, as measured from back of curb to the project perimeter wall, at 62 feet and 42 feet.
- *Lincoln Drive.* Lincoln Drive has a proposed right-of-way width of 130 feet, which is the Town's General Plan minimum width. The project landscape setback on this road is 25 feet less than the SUP guideline of 50 feet. The cross sections shown had the proposed landscape setback, as measured from back of curb to the project perimeter wall, at 53 feet. The Planning Commission raised a concern that this landscape setback will be reduced with the addition of deceleration lanes.

With the perimeter setback discussion ended at 8:30 p.m., Richard Frazee gave an update to the Planning Commission on some other items as follows:

- Clarification on how to calculate density, specifically that the 25-foot dedication along Lincoln Drive cannot be included in the overall parcel size.
- The applicant met with the water service representatives of EPCOR. EPCOR will be providing an updated will serve letter. Referring to the prior question last meeting about unintended costs to water consumers, he explained that the water improvement impact fee of approximately \$3,000,000 will be the responsibility of the property

owner of this project.

- Clarification on the open space graphic, to make sure it includes public and private open space, the numbers not include the Scottsdale portion, and to measure from the property lines.
- It was noted that the applicant will be reorienting Areas A1 and D.

The Planning Commission noted some processing items for the applicant. This includes the following:

- To add date stamps to delineate changes in the documents.
- Staff can deliver packets on Friday morning, in lieu of Tuesday afternoon
- The applicant must provide submittal items the second Friday prior to the Planning Commission meeting for staff review.
- The applicant will regroup and send out an updated agenda topic discussion calendar, noting that grading and drainage is not ready to be discussed on July 21, 2015.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

A. [15-114](#) Minutes from the October 7, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Wincel, to approve the Minutes from the October 7, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chairperson Strom, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Moore and Commissioner Wincel

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Mahrle and Commissioner Wainwright

Abstain: 1 - Commissioner Wastchak

B. [15-117](#) Minutes from the November 4, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Wincel, to approve the Minutes from the November 4, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Chairperson Strom, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Moore and Commissioner Wincel

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Mahrle and Commissioner Wainwright

Abstain: 1 - Commissioner Wastchak

C. [15-112](#) Minutes from the June 16, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Wincel, to approve the Minutes from the June 16, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Chairperson Strom, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Moore, Commissioner Wastchak and Commissioner Wincel

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Mahrle and Commissioner Wainwright

7. STAFF REPORTS

Paul Michaud noted that there were some 2014 minutes never approved, and that these will be put on a future agenda once the minutes are prepared.

8. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

It was noted that three Planning Commissioners terms will be up in October 2015 and it may be desirable to wrap up the Ritz application review before these terms end.

9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Paul Michaud reviewed the upcoming application items.

10. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Wastchak, seconded by Commissioner Moore, to ADJOURN. The meeting ended at 9:03 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Chairperson Strom, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Moore, Commissioner Wastchak and Commissioner Wincel

Absent: 2 - Commissioner Mahrle and Commissioner Wainwright