

TOWN OF PARADISE VALLEY



WASH PRESERVATION AND MODIFICATION CHARRETTE PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY

Below is a summary of the comments received during the April 5th, 2018 at 6 PM Wash Preservation and Modification Charrette which was held in the Town Hall Community Room. A series of written questions were distributed in a survey form, a total of 11 responses were received. Following each question below you will see the number of responses for each as well as their written comments underneath the table.

1. **IMPORTANCE OF WASHES AND OPEN SPACE** – Circle one in response to the following comment:

Washes are an important aspect that contribute to the beauty of the Town of Paradise Valley as they provide paths to convey stormwater runoff, corridors for wildlife, and character for our residents and visitors.

Strongly Agree 9	Agree 1	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree 1
---------------------	------------	-----------	----------	------------------------

Comments:

- 1.) Re-routing a natural wash never works!
- 2.) Agree that washes are important. However, Draconian measures will make more problems than is understood today.
- 3.) (blank)
- 4.) The guidelines are great to have and the T1, T2, T3 are thought out. It is a double edge sword, but, there might need to be some language for exceptions to a special lot. (Leaves room for developer to claim this and get away with persuading town to be lenient.)
- 5.) But a homeowner should have the choice on how they move water thru their property as long as the flow amount doesn't change.
- 6.) Agree to "allow" modification BUT only AFTER the impact of any modification is evaluated that will affect the existing neighbors, street, etc.
- 7.) (blank)
- 8.) (blank)
- 9.) Work w/ property owners and builders to come up with a solution that works for water flow and the dreams of the property owners.
- 10.) Believe some specific definitions & plans are needed but need to always plan for flexibility for future – as (illegible) in life → change.
- 11.) Options appear reasonable in concept. The 25% +/- cut off seems arbitrary. I believe 20% is more reasonable. Washes outside walls should never be altered in tier3, bridges ok. Rear yard if walled w/ruts ok.

2. **IMPORTANCE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS** – Circle one in response to the following comment:

Private property rights are the most important town value and the town should allow property owners to modify washes on their property in any manner so long as it does not negatively affect any other property owner.

Strongly Agree 5	Agree 2	Undecided	Disagree 3	Strongly Disagree 1
---------------------	------------	-----------	---------------	------------------------

Comments:

- 1.) Problems will occur when a property owner has water re-routed onto their property. The council has been very weak on this issue in the past.
- 2.) Prudence is the best outcome.
- 3.) (blank)
- 4.) This could be problematic when CFS out is accelerated and a culvert/drain pipe will most definitely speed the flow at the outflow, and conversely if you baffle it for fast flow it may back up at the inlet on the adjacent property.
- 5.) To implement no changes to wash now it only affects those who haven't developed their washes.
- 6.) Other property owner must enforce especially when neighbors are proactive and alert the town BEFORE building has begun but when 700+cy of fill is being delivered.
- 7.) (blank)
- 8.) Property owner should not be allowed to increase runoff or channel more runoff to downhill neighbors.
- 9.) The town can help the property owners understand water flow.
- 10.)(blank)
- 11.)(blank)

3. **PROTECTION OF NATURAL WASHES VERSUS PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS** – Respond to the following comment:

There should be a balance between wash preservation and private property rights and certain washes, based on their physical size or capacity, should be preserved.

Strongly Agree 4	Agree 3	Undecided	Disagree 1	Strongly Disagree 2
---------------------	------------	-----------	---------------	------------------------

Comments:

- 1.) (blank)
- 2.) (blank)
- 3.) (blank)
- 4.) For prior comments reason. Each property and its wash are unique. Guidelines are good, but like the cyclists, not all owners are going to honor them when inspectors are gone.
- 5.) A homeowner shouldn't be forced to preserve a wash on their private property maintaining flow should be the only requirement.
- 6.) Case by case evaluation- pros and cons w/neighboring properties having input since they historical experience.
- 7.) (blank)
- 8.) (blank)
- 9.) (blank)
- 10.)(blank)
- 11.)Property rights prevail but with limitations we are PV and developers can work with reasonable solutions.

4. **PROPOSED TIER SYSTEM** – Please provide any comments you have regarding the proposed tiered system as you understand it from tonight's presentation.

- 1.) (blank)
- 2.) (blank)
- 3.) Please consider increasing the peak discharge capacity to 100cfs from 50cfs.
- 4.) I like the system. Would like to get more specificity about walls/fences out of washes. Engineer has to come up with a better trash rack solution and if these are allowed in washes, wash crossings over the wash should be allowed to have foundation and pilaster in wash based on an approved design that allows flow around it like a wall/fence.
- 5.) Again I feel homeowners should have the right to develop their lot as they wish as long as the water flow can happen there are enough codes to follow just to build why add to this.
- 6.) Allows for much interpretation which is good but must be evaluated HONESTLY – both past and future complications.
- 7.) (blank)
- 8.) (blank)
- 9.) Too complex, to rule heavy.
- 10.) I think staying with simplicity of plan is always best.
- 11.) Ok- see first comments. *Except for hillside lots only 1&3, no #2. No major diversions. Bridges/Spans ok as specified. Think Frank Lloyd Wright's "falling water."

5. OTHER COMMENTS

- 1.) You are welcome to visit my property so you can see the result of re-routing washes as well as changing the elevations of streets adjacent to my property.
- 2.) (blank)
- 3.) (blank)
- 4.) Washes are a big part of the town of PV, - always lived next to one for all my years living in PV.
- 5.) (blank)
- 6.) Please always be PROACTIVE meaning evaluate during the concept phase & send notices to nearby neighbors. Do not enforce FEMA reg. when not in a floodplain which then results in harm – elevating a home.
- 7.) (blank)
- 8.) (blank)
- 9.) Just work with property owners.
- 10.) (blank)
- 11.) Major diversions of washes, even if “engineered” seem to always be problematic. I am more in favor of culverts that stay to natural line of wash versus a major diversion.