



Town of Paradise Valley

Minutes

Hillside Building Committee

Wednesday, September 11, 2019 at 8:00 AM Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Jarson called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

In Attendance:

Chair Scott Jarson

Member James Anton

Member Scott Tonn

Member John Wainwright

Member Tom Campbell

Others present:

Hugo Vasquez, Hillside Development Administrator

George Burton, Planner

2. EXECUTIVE SESSION

3. APPLICATION REVIEW

4. STAFF REPORTS

Combined Review for an addition of an attached two-car garage at 4055 E Keim Drive (APN 169-22-071).

Linda Tellis, Owner

Don Anderson, Civil Engineer, Anderson-Nelsen

Stephen Mott, Builder, Stephen Mott Inc

Hugo Vasquez, Hillside Development Administrator, stated that this application is for a garage addition. He provided a 3-D rendering of the project. He indicated that the grading plan reflects that they will be holding retention for the new disturbances. Site disturbance is being increased by 1,000 square feet. They are still under the allowable disturbance area of 16,340 square feet. Stucco, Dunn Edwards LRV-38, will be utilized to match the existing material of the home. A dark brown metal roof will be installed. New pavers, LRV-31, will match those already in use.



Linda Tellis, Owner, commented that they decided to add the additional garage for their truck which has been stolen twice. They also want to do some interior work on the house. The pad is already in place. No additional disturbance will happen on the site.

Chair Jarson asked if they are adding retention on the front of the lot.

Mr. Vasquez indicated that due to the added driveway, he requested that additional retention be added for the increase disturbance area.

Chair Jarson asked if the addition would disturb existing flows.

Mr. Vasquez explained that it would not. He then provided a Google Street View of the property.

Ms. Tellis indicated that two trees will need to be removed to accommodate the drive and garage expansion.

Member Wainwright asked if landscaping would be a part of the project.

Ms. Tellis mentioned that it would not.

Member Campbell asked about sheet six of the architectural drawings regarding exterior lighting. He believes the placement is prudent and meets code. He mentioned that the lighting must have a 45-degree cutoff.

Chair Jarson stated that along the front of the garage it shows three fixtures called out as WP, motion sensors.

Ms. Tellis responded that lighting will not be added to the front of the house.

Member Campbell requested a cut sheet for Staff to look at to ensure compliance with town code.

Chair Jarson agreed and stated that a fixture should be placed by the back door for safety. Any fixture on the front of the house will have to come back to Staff for their review.

Member Anton mentioned that they don't want the house overly lit but safety is important. He asked how long the existing pavers have been in place.

Ms. Tellis replied about five to eight years. She then explained where some of the existing pavers would be relocated for the new driveway. They are planning to use some of their neighbor's pavers as well.

Member Anton asked if the height of the two garage doors could be the same.



Ms. Tellis explained that there will be a step down and then fill be will added. This will bump the garage door slightly higher.

Member Anton suggested that the garage doors contain the same height.

Ms. Tellis called Stephen Mott, Builder, and put him on speaker phone.

Stephen mentioned that the existing garage door does not need to be has high and the design was based on function of the garage space. He commented that he could increase the height so the doors match but the construction members will need to be addressed.

Member Campbell agreed with having the doors match the same size.

Member Tonn indicated that plans show a large landscaping area will be removed on the front.

Ms. Tellis commented that the flower bed acts as retaining and will remain. She then pointed out a plan that showed the landscaping area being preserved.

The Committee agreed the plans need to be revised to be consistent.

Member Wainwright encouraged the applicant to relocate or replace the two trees that are being removed. He indicated that it should not be a stipulation but if the opportunity arises it should be considered.

Chair Jarson invited public comment.

Christa Petracca, resident at 8002 N 47th Street, stated that it looks perfectly fine to her.

Chair Jarson motioned to approve item 19-332 with the stipulations as provided by staff 1-9 with the following additional stipulations:

- Motion sensor lights to be labeled on sheet six shall be submitted for approval by staff and chair and shall meet code requirements
- Garage door heights shall match at eight feet
- Existing raised planting bed at the northwest corner of existing drive shall remain and plans shall be revised on page 3 of 6 and submitted to Staff and the Chair for approval

Member Anton seconded the motion.

The motion passed 5-0.



Combined Review for an addition of an exercise room at 4201 E Keim Drive (APN 169-22-042).

Matt Thomas, Architect, Matt Thomas Architecture

Chair Jarson introduced the agenda item.

Mr. Vasquez indicated the applicant is proposing an addition of an exercise room on the ground floor. He is having difficulty reaching the second floor. The expansion will be contained with existing disturbed land. They are allowed up to 42,000 square feet of disturbed area and are proposing to disturb 28,000 square feet. Water for the addition will be retained onsite. They are proposing to use stone on the exterior and will reuse existing light fixtures. These fixtures are not conforming. The plan is to match existing materials.

Matt Thomas, Architect, mentioned that they are planning to remove some of the existing lighting but will reuse some as well. He then overviewed the materials being used on the site. A wood window will be replaced. DC Ranch Cobble Stone will be used. It was difficult to find the same roof tile because it is an older material.

Member Anton mentioned that on the grading and drainage plan, note number three says "retention basin" but it cannot be found on the plan.

The applicant showed on the plan where the two retention areas are on the plan.

Member Anton commented that it must be numbered incorrectly.

Chair Jarson stated that he is fine with keeping the lights that are being reused because some are being removed.

Member Campbell agreed because it will help with continuity.

(Member Tonn motioned to approve to application with the proposed conditions 1-8, in addition to stipulation 9 to correct plan C2 to remove note three.

Member Anton seconded the motion.

The motion passed 5-0.

Combined Review for modifications to a previously approved site plan at 8002 N 47th Street (APN 169-11-123).

Christa Petracca, Owner

Don Surface, Civil Engineer, Surface Engineering Co

Mr. Vasquez presented the previously approved site plan. He mentioned that the applicant is abandoning the approved driveway. They would like to keep the existing



driveway on the north which runs through a third parcel. Additional retention will be provided to accommodate the addition disturbed site area. The applicant will also work with the Town to add a trench drive on the driveway and directing it to an existing culvert. They are reducing the disturbed area from 26,000 to 25,000 square feet. Retaining walls and curbs will be used for retention.

Christa Petracca, Owner, indicated that the site layout appears to work well with the current driveway. She mentioned that water is not running across the road.

Mr. Vasquez indicated on the aerial plan where retaining walls will be located. He commented that the new retaining walls will match the grouted stone material of the existing retaining walls.

Christa Petracca, Applicant and Owner commented that there may not be enough natural stones on site so they could use a veneer material.

Chair Jarson stated that a resident on Charles Drive may have extra natural stone. He asked if native seed mix would be used for the site. He asked what the surface of the retention areas would be.

Mr. Vasquez indicated that she will place rock in these areas.

Member Campbell asked what the plan is for the third lot that the driveway go through.

Ms. Petracca stated that they do want to do anything except for directing water.

Member Campbell stated that it is unusual that the driveway does not come from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Vasquez mentioned the applicant has submitted an ingress/egress easement. This will need to be recorded.

Ms. Petracca mentioned that the approved plan did have the driveway accessing directly to the right-of-way.

Chair Jarson commented that leaving the existing driveway will limit the overall impact of the property and leaves the third lot from being developed.

Ms. Petracca mentioned the property is now an estate and she does not want to chop up the property.

Member Anton asked if they could complete a lot combination to combine the three lots.

Member Campbell stated that they could do this.



Chair Jarson asked if the lot combination would create issues with setbacks and non-conformities.

Ms. Petracca stated that she would like to have a choice on whether or not to combine the property. She asked the Committee to take into consideration that they are only remodeling the house.

Member Tonn stated that the applicant approached the Committee regarding a plan which was approved. He added that now the applicant is requesting to change the plan to serve the house with a different driveway.

Mr. Vasquez indicated that Staff agreed they would not be able to force her to combine the property.

Chair Jarson commented that if an easement is recorded and someone requested to develop the third lot, they would then have to deal with the easement.

Member Campbell mentioned the retaining walls that will be added could limit the third lot from developing. He is not a fan of the plan from a policy stand point.

George Burton, Planner, stated that they reviewed this plan with the Town Attorney's office. The Town Attorney told them that they could only require an ingress/egress easement to ensure access to the property. They have combined two of the three lots to get conformance with the home.

Member Tonn asked if in the future someone wants to build a home on the third lot, would there be any restrictions.

Mr. Burton responded that if they wanted to modify the easement, they would have to rededicate it in conjunction with the new home. The driveway may be shared between the two homes.

Member Tonn asked if the Town is okay with the applicant modifying the approved plan and if they received outside counsel.

Mr. Burton replied that the Town is fine with the modifications and they only met with the Town Attorney's office.

Chair Jarson mentioned that right now there would be less disturbance on the Hillside which they are asked to protect.

Ms. Petracca mentioned that a guest home could be placed on the third lot.



Member Wainwright stated that they are fortunate in having this type of proposal right now. It is superior than the previous approval. He asked if there is an opportunity to have a nonvehicular easement in the front.

Member Campbell asked for the size of the third lot.

Ms. Petracca mentioned that it is 1.3 acres in size.

Member Wainwright stated that the applicant wants to retain her options. He believes they made great progress in combining the first two lots. He mentioned that it would be difficult to construct a home on the third lot with the driveway located in the same place. He believes it would be too much for the Committee to require the applicant to give up the third lot.

Member Tonn asked if the easement description allows for the driveway to be relocated or does it need to remain where it is proposed.

Mr. Burton explained that the driveway easement will have a description and if relocated, the easement would need to be amended.

Chair Jarson asked if the applicant would list the two parcels separately or together.

Ms. Petracca mentioned that the value would be in selling the two parcels together.

Member Tonn stated that he is not in favor of the project if the easement is not permanent.

Member Anton asked if they are creating a flag lot if the third lot develops in the future.

Mr. Burton stated that the flag lot has already been created with the previous approvals.

Member Anton indicated that from a Hillside stand point there would be less impact by approving the existing driveway to serve three acres.

Chair Jarson indicated that he would be in favor of approving the application. He mentioned that the recordation of the easement would impair the sale of the third lot. He believes that it does impact the Hillside less.

He asked for feedback from the Committee if the following motion were to be made:

- Disturbed areas including detention basins would have to match existing site materials, colors and LRV and be treated with Sonora seed mix for vegetation
- Ingress and Egress access easement must be recorded in tandem with the approval of this application



Member Tonn, Campbell and Anton indicated that they would vote against the motion.

Member Anton explained that if they vote no, they will have finality on the estate sooner.

Member Tonn indicated that he would vote no because the easement does not mean anything unless there is a three-party agreement including the Town. The existing approval provides the most financial benefits to future owners to allow the lots to be in compliance. The third lot can be developed. Additionally, there was time and energy put into the approval with the existing plan. He wants the plan to stay in place.

Ms. Petracca stated that it could take up to a year to sell the property. She feels that the Committee is requiring her to combine the house. She does not want to build the driveway and rip up the Hillside.

Member Tonn stated that the path forward to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy is to follow the approval plan.

Mr. Burton mentioned that the lot combination would take approximately 6-8 weeks.

Member Campbell asked if they could approve the application with a stipulation that the lot combination be approved.

Mr. Burton stated that he does not believe legally they can approve it this way since the third lot was not a part of the application.

Chair Jarson commented that he did not want to leave the impression that the Committee is dictating lot use.

Member Campbell motioned to go into executive session to confer with the Town Attorney for legal advice on file APN 19-334.

Member Wainwright seconded the motion.

The motion passed 5-0.

Chair Jarson reconvened the Hillside Building Committee Meeting. He stated that the consensus among the Committee is that they find a path forward for the application. He suggested a few options. The applicant could continue the application providing time to explore her options. They could consider combining the lot and mentioned how the access easement is crafted could go along way with the applicant.

Member Wainwright mentioned that the next date could be within 30 days.



Ms. Petracca stated that she does not want to be continued, then come back, and have several conditions added.

Member Campbell stated that one option is to approve the application with a stipulation that the lots be combined. The lot combo process is done administratively.

Member Tonn indicated that if they come back, the request can be modified. This would not require additional noticing.

Chair Jarson stated that the easiest path would be to combine the lots. He indicated that if the applicant decides to keep the lots separate, the new easement will need to provide the Town the ability to approve the relocation or abandonment of the easement.

Member Campbell noted that not all members of the Committee are in favor of this.

Chair Jarson motioned to continue the application to the next Hillside Building Committee meeting scheduled tentatively October 9, 2019 subject to verification.

Member Anton seconded the motion.

The motion passed 5-0.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

6. NEXT MEETING DATE

Chair Jarson indicated that the next meeting is on October 9, 2019 at 8:00 AM.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jarson motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Member Campbell seconded the motion.

The motion passed 5-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 a.m.