



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes – Draft

Planning Commission

Chair Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Timothy Dickman
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner William Nassikas
Commissioner James Rose

Tuesday, April 18, 2023

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Liepmann called the meeting to order at 6:02 PM.

Present 7 – Chair Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Timothy Dickman
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner William Nassikas
Commissioner James Rose

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Senior Planner George Burton
Community Development Director Lisa Collins
Planning Manager Paul Michaud

2. EXECUTIVE SESSION

3. APPROVAL OR AMENDMENT OF MINUTES

A. 23-130 Approval of the April 4, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Locke, seconded by Commissioner Covington, to approve the minutes. The motion carried with the following vote:

Aye: 7 – Chair Liepmann, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Dickman, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas, Commissioner Rose

4. PRESENTATIONS

A. 23-124 **Discussion Presentation by Scottsdale Plaza Resort Representatives & Discussion with Planning Commission on Scottsdale Plaza Resort Intermediate Special Use Permit, 7200 N Scottsdale Road**

Mr. Michaud provided an overview of the item. He mentioned that the Commission requested the presentation on parking and architecture, and the applicant would be leading the discussion. Although a parking and traffic study are not required by the Zoning Ordinance, these are generally submitted and reviewed with an intermediate amendment. The Statement of Direction from the Council states that the Planning Commission has the traffic and parking studies as a resource to understand the scope of the project and if applicable provide general input should parking and circulation affect the design or impact to nearby residents. In terms of architecture, there were no specific directives, but the General Plan policies attached to the staff report highlighted the need for context-appropriate, high-quality design. The Commission was only required to request what was necessary in terms of plans and documents.

Paul Basha, a consulting traffic engineer, presented the findings of the traffic and parking studies for the Plaza Resort renovations. He introduced several people representing Highgate Hotels, including Dina Winder, the property owner; Michael Stromer, the architect with HKS in Los Angeles; and Tom Galvin, an attorney with Rose Law Group. Mr. Basha presented an aerial photograph of the existing property and noted the substantial difference between the available parking and the needed parking. He then focused on the details of the parking occupancy count and presented the parking rates needed for hotel guests and conference room users. He listed the assumptions made about how many parking spaces were needed for each property use and subtracted the parking spaces needed for people who were not hotel guests. The initial calculation was that the property needed 488 parking spaces, but after examining shared parking models, the recommendation was 571 parking spaces. The proposed renovation would remove 255 parking spaces, leaving 483 remaining parking spaces. To reach the required 571 parking spaces, they proposed adding 88 underground parking spaces and 85 additional valet parking.

Commissioner Nassikas asked about how the parking places for staff were calculated, given that the new restaurants could have more employees than the hotel.

Mr. Basha explained that the employee-parked vehicles were included in the parking occupancy count and that the same rate for future analysis included the employees. He also mentioned that there were no designated parking areas for employee parking, but there was sufficient parking for all users of the property, and the on-site manager would designate where employees should park.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about the expectation of staff and traffic with the redevelopment.

Mr. Basha explained that the parking rate for the three new restaurants was 121 spaces, which was sufficient for diners and employees. The number of seats for the restaurants was not yet known, but they were high-end restaurants with spacious seats and tables designed for leisurely dining.

Commissioner Dickman expressed concern about the low number of parking spaces allocated for the restaurants. Mr. Basha clarified that this was in addition to the number of parking spaces occupied by hotel guests who were also using the restaurants.

Commissioner Locke asked about the percentage of conference room users who are hotel guests and expressed concern about the parking availability for local conference attendees who drive their own cars.

Mr. Basha explained that the plaza resort was intended for hotel guests to use the conference rooms and that the 20% of conference room users that they were suggesting as needing parking spaces was already a high number. He also clarified that the ballroom would still be used regularly, but the diners would be hotel guests.

Commissioner Rose questioned this reasoning and suggested that banquets could have outside attendees.

Mr. Basha reiterated that each hotel had its own intended audience, and the plaza resort was designed for hotel guests to stay in hotel rooms and use conference rooms.

Commissioner Rose asked if the resort would only book the banquet into their conference room if guests stayed at the resort.

Dina Winder, representing Highgate Hotel, explained that preference went to groups bringing in guest room and banquet revenue, but they would book non-hotel guests if the ballroom was available. However, this was rare since the business that was booked into the room was generally associated with a group staying at the resort.

Commissioner Rose suggested that 59 more parking spaces might not be enough for larger banquets with up to 500 people.

Mr. Basha clarified that the resort had agreements with two other properties for extra parking, and parking would be accommodated weeks and months in advance.

Commissioner Nassikas questioned if valet parking at other locations was the planned practice for big events, and Mr. Basha confirmed.

Ms. Winder explained that they would staff accordingly and had enough people going back and forth for these types of events.

Mr. Basha explained that events at the resort are planned in advance and that the resort has arrangements with nearby locations for extra parking. Commissioner Rose requested a breakdown of parking spaces needed for guests, restaurants, ballrooms, and the spa and also wanted to know how the number of employees.

Mr. Basha responded that offsite parking was not needed but was provided in response to a request from the Town of Paradise Valley. He also showed a slide that indicated 62% of parking spaces on the property were unused.

Commissioner Dickman asked if the yellow stacked bar showing parking for meeting rooms in the shared parking model was sufficient for Friday night events, and Ms. Basha confirmed it was for the meeting rooms.

Chair Liepmann asked if the green spaces showing parking for the spa in the shared parking model would be available in the evening, and Mr. Basha explained they would be because the spa would be closed.

Mr. Michaud reminded the Commissioners to keep in mind that space usage was not always straightforward, as someone in a restaurant or meeting room might use parking spaces designated for other areas.

Commissioner Georgelos understood that the resort's standard practice was to have most of its guests use the accommodations as guests of the hotel, with deviations for ballroom events. The Commission was looking at parking lot models and not exact usage. Commissioner Georgelos noted that the resort had a lot of unused parking spaces in the past.

Chair Liepmann asked about the restaurants and whether they would serve lunch or breakfast.

Ms. Winder responded that they had not yet identified the operators but anticipated one would serve both lunch and dinner while the other two would only serve dinner.

Michael Stromer, an architect for the project, introduced his firm to the Commissioners, highlighting their international presence and sector-based practices. He presented some of their past projects, which included five-star resorts and urban projects worldwide, emphasizing their quality of work. Mr. Stromer then focused on specific areas of the project they were asked to provide. He showcased the proposed scale and size of the restaurants and how they would stand out to serve both the hotel guests and the local community. He also presented the 'Big Sister' lobby building, a new building that would provide a welcoming approach to guests. The building was inspired by mid-century modern architecture

and intended to have a different character to provide clear wayfinding. Lastly, Mr. Stromer talked about the new guest room building, which was replacing the surface parking area. It was influenced by the existing architecture and used related materiality and architectural vocabulary to blend in but not replicate.

Commissioner Nassikas thanked Mr. Stromer for his presentation and asked about the red tile roofing materials on the existing buildings.

Mr. Stromer confirmed that the clay tile roofs on the guest room buildings would remain, except for the 'Little Sister' porte-cocher, which would be redesigned to provide a better welcome experience.

Commissioner Dickman asked for clarification on whether the old buildings would be painted to match the new ones.

Mr. Stromer replied that the plan was to freshen them up and bring in more natural light.

Commissioner Nassikas asked about the possibility of the restaurant operators adding their feel to the architecture.

Ms. Winder responded that each restaurant would have its own feel but would stay in the same style.

Commissioner Georgelos asked how the old buildings would blend with the new buildings in a resort renovation project.

Mr. Stromer explained that while some areas would have a more midcentury feel, there would be no major face-lifts of existing buildings to get them to match. Instead, different architectural styles would allow for unique guest experiences.

Commissioner Georgelos wanted a cohesive theme running through the resort.

Mr. Stromer suggested that materiality and wayfinding would tie everything together visually.

Commissioner Dickman asked if the resort would have one or two brands.

Ms. Winder explained that there would be two separate brands, but the same team would operate both.

Commissioner Rose asked if the three restaurants in the resort renovation project would be built at the same time or as they were leased.

Ms. Winder explained that they were still working through the phasing of the project, which was complicated and would be done in phases.

Because of the underground garage, all three restaurants were expected to be built at the same time.

Commissioner Nassikas welcomed the team to Paradise Valley and thanked them for taking the time to answer questions.

5. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS – LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

7. ACTION ITEMS

A. 23-131 Discussion and Possible Action of Club Estates 7 Lot Split (LS-21-02). 5639 E Joshua Tree Lane (APN: 169-32-932)

Mr. Burton provided an overview of the item. This was a lot split proposal to the Commission for review and action. The applicant wanted to subdivide a two-acre parcel into two lots but was requesting two deviations from the Town Code. The Commission is acting as a recommending body and will forward a recommendation to the Town Council for review and action. Lot one maintained the existing home, but the Ramada must be removed to comply with the floor ratio requirements. New lot two will be one net acres and will be required the removal of part of the existing fence wall to comply with the code. The applicant requested two deviations of unorthodox shaped lots and the new lot line not perpendicular to the right-of-way, which staff did not support. The Commission expressed concerns about the modifications and the applicant provided two options in response. However, neither option eliminated the requested deviations. The Commission was given three potential actions: a recommendation of denial, recommendation of approval subject to stipulations, or continuation of the application for further review.

Commissioner Dickman asked if the stipulations in the recommendation for approval were compliant with one of the options.

Mr. Burton explained that the stipulations meant everything would be in compliance with the submitted plans and documents.

Ms. Collins added that the stipulations would mean recommending in favor of the deviation.

Commissioner Nassikas asked if the demolition of the house was part of the deviation, but Mr. Burton clarified that it was not and only the Ramada will be demolished to comply with the lot coverage requirements.

Commissioner Dickman clarified that the Commission was only asked to respond to the applicant's request and not evaluate alternatives.



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes – Draft

Planning Commission

Chair James Rose
Commissioner Tim Dickman
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner William Nassikas

Tuesday, April 4, 2023

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Rose called the meeting to order at 6:03 PM.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Senior Planner George Burton
Community Development Director Lisa Collins
Planning Manager Paul Michaud

2. ROLL CALL

Present 6 – Chairman James Rose
Commissioner Tim Dickman
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner William Nassikas
Absent 1 – Commissioner Kristina Locke

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

**A. 23-107 Discussion Scottsdale Plaza Resort Intermediate Special Use Permit
7200 N Scottsdale Road**

Mr. Michaud provided an overview of the item. The proposal included demolishing an existing building and replacing it with three restaurant buildings, constructing new guest unit buildings, a spa building, and a fitness building. The proposal also included 571 parking spaces and extra

capacity in valet mode for a total of 656 spaces. The parking and traffic studies meet professional standards. A final lighting plan adhered to the Special Use Permit Guidelines.

Planning Commission members asked questions about drainage, the location of trees, and the screening of utility boxes.

Mr. Michaud continued with discussing the noise of the resort, including the pickleball court noise, and stated that the resort would operate within the Town's noise parameters. He added that there were very few complaints that the resort had received in the past.

The group then discussed the look of the new buildings and how they would match the existing architecture.

Commissioner Covington asked if the materials used in the new construction would mimic the older building.

Mr. Michaud confirmed that they would match the existing architecture.

Commissioner Georgelos mentioned that the old red tile on the main lodge clearly gives a Mediterranean, Tuscan, or even a Latin feel.

Commissioner Covington agreed that the new buildings looked unusual but also mentioned that the roof lines were a factor.

Commissioner Georgelos mentioned that some areas, such as the portecochere and entry points, did not blend well and needed to be softened.

Ms. Collins explained that the construction drawings would be consistent with the plans presented. However, Commissioner Covington worried that the three restaurants planned for the southeast corner would take away too much green space.

Chairman Rose and Commissioner Georgelos asked if the architects could give further input to blend the old with the new design.

Ms. Collins agreed to arrange for the architects to speak at a later date. She added that study sessions were usually just for staff and Planning Commission members but suggested that the applicant could provide additional information before the action hearing.

Mr. Michaud suggested having a presentation specifically on the architecture, and Ms. Collins agreed.

Commissioner Covington expressed his preference for architects to do the architecture and not the Planning Commission. He believed it was not their purview to tell architects what kind of architecture they should do.

Chairman Rose agreed that they should not define the architecture but suggested hearing from the architect and giving feedback to better understand the project.

Mr. Michaud believed the architects would be happy to describe their thought process.

Commissioner Covington asked about the takeaway from the traffic studies.

Mr. Michaud explained that the project did not cause any additional improvements along Scottsdale Road, Hummingbird Lane, or Indian Bend, but unrelated improvements were already in process.

Chairman Rose expressed concerns about the parking situation with the addition of 64 units, three restaurants, and more employees. He questioned the practicality of offsite parking and wondered if there would be enough on-site parking.

Mr. Michaud explained that the applicant pursued offsite parking based on direction from the Planning Commission, but the parking analysis showed that the 561 regular spaces met their needs.

Ms. Collins added that there was no opportunity to park in nearby neighborhoods and that the applicant had hired professionals to determine the required amount of parking. She suggested that the traffic engineer could review the parking situation and provide information during the presentation.

Commissioner Covington suggested getting a presentation from individuals experienced in parking and resorts to address concerns.

Chairman Rose agreed that parking could affect traffic flow and suggested understanding the parking study in the presentation.

Ms. Collins agreed to have a presentation about parking and the level of service.

Commissioner Nassikas brought up concerns about staff members and parking availability, which Mr. Michaud addressed.

Commissioner Covington asked if there was a way to estimate the number of people on the property.

Mr. Michaud explained that there were generic guidelines for parking but the Special Use Permit Guidelines allow for a parking analysis.

Commissioner Georgelos suggested having the applicant address the Planning Commission before the hearing, which Ms. Collins and Mr.

Michaud agreed could be done through a presentation. In addition, they discussed how to properly advertise and notice the upcoming meeting.

Ms. Collins suggested having a presentation during a study session on April 18 and scheduling the hearing for May 2.

B. 23-099 Discussion of Club Estates 7 Lot Split (LS-21-02). 5639 E Joshua Tree Lane (APN: 169-32-932)

Mr. Burton provided an overview of the item. The proposed lot is a request for deviations from two development standards in the Town Code that the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to Town Council and Town Council takes action. He provided background information about the property, stating that it was originally platted in 1957 as two lots and combined in 2015. The applicant proposed subdividing it into two lots, keeping the existing house on Lot 1, which would comply with the 25% ratio requirement. Lot 2 would be just over an acre. He explained that the applicant angled the new property line to meet the one-acre requirement and keep the house without deviating from the setback requirements, but the staff was not supportive of the deviation. Staff recommended suggestions, such as moving the lot line further east, which would require demolishing a part of the existing house. The applicant proposed roadway improvements and added drainage and public utility easements. The public meeting is scheduled for April 18.

Commissioner Covington asked about the odd curve and driveway, which Mr. Burton clarified.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the staff's recommended alternatives.

Mr. Burton explained that the staff suggested moving the lot line further east, which would have required demolishing a part of the house.

Ms. Collins discussed the issue of setbacks if the lot line were straightened and mentioned the need for a variance.

Commissioner Georgelos asked Mr. Burton to show the historical layout of the two previously divided lots, and Mr. Burton confirmed that there were two homes on the lots.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if the house was already there.

Mr. Burton explained that the houses were built before annexation and may have been built under county standards. If the lot line were moved further east, a portion of the house would have to be demolished to comply with the setback requirements.

Ms. Collins discussed the issue of setbacks and the need for a variance.

A. [23-049](#) Discussion and Possible Action
 Recommendation to Extend the Review Period for the Scottsdale Plaza
 Resort Intermediate Special Use Permit
 7200 N Scottsdale Road

Mr. Michaud provided an overview of the item. He stated that the applicant is still working on some of the requested items, such as information in the parking analysis, noise analysis, exterior signs, lighting, landscaping, and walls. The applicant is planning to defer the exterior signs to a later date. He concluded that the request this evening is for action to recommend Town Council extend the review period from March 24th to May 24th.

Commissioner Campbell asked if they would receive the information in time for the March 21st meeting.

Mr. Michaud confirmed that they would not have enough time and that the Commission would see the information at the April 4th meeting instead.

Commissioner Georgelos requested additional information on the architecture to better understand the exterior of the existing buildings that will be repainted/remodeled and how these will blend with the new buildings.

Commissioner Campbell added that additional renderings/elevations along the south and east such as at the porte-cochere/main lodge and three new restaurants would be helpful.

The Planning Commission agreed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Covington, that the Planning Commission request that the Town Council in accordance with Section 1102.3.C.3.c of the Zoning Ordinance and Section 2-5-1.C of the Town Code modify the Statement of Direction (SOD) to extend the Planning Commission review period for the Scottsdale Plaza Resort Intermediate Special Use Permit amendment application (SUP-22-02) from March 24, 2023 to on or before May 24, 2023. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

7. CONSENT AGENDA

A. [23-074](#) Approval of the February 7, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Liepmann, seconded by Commissioner Georgelos, to approve the February 7, 2023 minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

Council will not be sidestepped. The idea behind the proposed changes is to move quickly and meet all code requirements while addressing the concerns raised by citizens over the years regarding coverage. She emphasized that there may be some locations where this solution would help resolve those concerns, but it was not meant to suggest that more managerial amendments would follow. She added that other Personal Wireless Service Facilities may occur and these will be reviewed via the Conditional Use Permit process.

Chairman Rose stated that he wanted the residents to have input regardless of the outcome. He made suggestions for streamlining the process.

Commissioner Liepmann brought up making the timeline in Section 1213.A and Section 1213.C of the proposed text amendment to including a timeframe and it be consistent.

Ms. Collins commented on the objective that once the application was complete, it could be reviewed within days. If it was approved, the Town Manager would send the managerial application to the Town Council.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if the Planning Commission could see examples of a situation where Personal Wireless Service Facility approvals were not made or not continued due to funding. She did not like the proposed process. She wanted clarification on what was driving the timeframe.

Commissioner Campbell suggested they could streamline the Conditional Use Permit process. He reiterated that the proposed managerial process impacts public input opportunity and thinks residents will express concerns after these structures are constructed.

Commissioner Georgelos agreed.

Commissioner Covington asked if the purpose of streamlining the process was to benefit the applicants or the Town.

Ms. Collins replied that it would benefit both, with the purpose to close coverage gaps.

Chairman Rose opened the Citizen Review Session. Ms. Brady, a resident, asked if the only Town owned site was the Invergordon site and whether this allowance applied to all Town-owned property

Ms. Collins replied the Invergordon is the only Town owned site of the five sites and the managerial process applied only to these five sites.

No Reportable Action

5. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

- A. [23-009](#) Discussion of Scottsdale Plaza Intermediate Special Use Permit
7200 N Scottsdale Road (SUP-22-02)

Chairman Rose disclosed that he and the Town's Planning Manager attended the neighborhood meeting on February 6, 2023 for this item.

Mr. Michaud greeted the Planning Commission members and explained that the meeting would consist of a conversation between staff and the Commission, with the possibility of opening it up to other individuals at the discretion of the chair. The main topic of discussion was an Intermediate Special Use Permit amendment for the Scottsdale Plaza Resort, which had been reviewed by the Planning Commission last at the December 20, 2022 meeting. He presented the site plan and highlighted the changes proposed, noting that the major changes are in the southeast portion of the site. He explained he would cover each Statement of Direction topic separately summarizing the Town guidelines, how the request meets these guidelines, and additional information Town staff believes that the applicant should provide for the Planning Commission to complete their review.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the existing and proposed uses noting these comply with Section 1102.2 of the Zoning Ordinance. No specific comments or question were noted.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the noise mitigation/impact to adjacent uses. He covered various outdoor areas that could potentially create negative impact, reviewed the Town's noise regulations, summarized the noise analysis provided by the applicant for this request, reviewed past noise complaints over the last four years, and draft stipulations.

Commissioner Liepmann asked if they noise analysis considered the noise difference between tennis and pickleball.

Mr. Michaud explained that the property currently has two tennis courts located within the courtyard area of the main resort pool, with the applicant noting these are proposed for conversion to two pickleball courts. He stated he would follow up with the acoustical engineer that prepared the analysis.

Mr. Michaud summarized the Planning Commission direction that the applicant provide more information to understand measures the resort can put in place to further mitigate potential situations to align with the proactive work by the Town on resort noise. These are both physical (noise limiter and/or to increase the number, distribution of loudspeakers, constructing walls/gates at the access points on the north elevations of the main pool area building) and operational means. He added the other is to verify impact of pickleball courts compared to tennis courts in the modeling of the noise analysis.

Mr. Michaud then moved on to review the density, lot coverage, and floor area ratio, which had been discussed at the previous meeting. He noted that the existing density (one guest unit per 3,934 square feet) and the proposed density (one guest unit per 3,396 square feet) are both less than the guideline of one guest unit per 4,000 square feet. He noted that the request complies with

the maximum guideline of 25-percent lot coverage, maximum 60 percent impervious area, and minimum open space area of 40 percent. The request has a lot coverage of 22 percent, impervious coverage of 40 percent, and open space area of 60 percent. He reviewed the floor area ratio and compared it to the chart with other resorts, noting that the 29 percent floor area ratio falls within the range of current Town resorts between 11 percent and 35 percent.

Mr. Michaud discussed the guidelines for maximum building heights and open space criteria. He explained that the guidelines for principal structures allow for a maximum height of 36 feet, accessory structures a maximum height of 24 feet, and service structures a maximum height of 18 feet. He also explained the open space criteria. All the existing and proposed structures are within these guidelines. He showed a graphic that the applicant provided on how the porte-cochere meets the open space criteria (which was the one area in question). He also noted that the applicant revised the floor plan of the pool viewing deck showing the north view as a solid wall as discussed at the December work session.

Commissioner Campbell stated that based on drawings he saw he believes this north elevation was always a solid wall as it will be used to stack the glass wall panels that opens on the west elevation. He added that the drawings shown during the walk-through satisfied his concerns about exposure to the north of the property.

There was discussion about the use of the pool viewing deck.

Commissioner Georgelos questioned whether there would be a restriction on music, even without amplification the noise which would carry throughout the area and reverberate.

Mr. Michaud noted there was a stipulation on amplified music.

Chairman Rose expressed concern about the pool viewing deck, its use, and the number of people who will be there.

Commissioner Locke noted it was not indicated it would be an event space based on the tour they were given.

Commissioner Georgelos expressed concerns noted that the space's purpose seemed inconsistent with what had been previously discussed. She suggested that the Commission should further discuss what they would like to see in the space and how it should operate.

Commissioner Liepmann stated that after going on the tour, they felt more comfortable with the layout and physical limitations of the viewing deck. She mentioned she had no concerns as long as the stipulations were followed, such as no amplified music and no permanent bar structure.

Mr. Michaud understood that there could be temporary food and alcohol areas as part of resort events, but no permanent bars would be allowed. Stipulation 39 covered all the outdoor areas, including the pool viewing deck, event lawns, and other similar areas. The pool viewing deck would have a solid wall and no amplified music, with such activities prohibited between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. daily. The sound would always need to comply with the Town's noise code.

The Commission discussed the stipulations and whether they were strong enough but ultimately felt comfortable with them based on the layout they saw during the tour.

Commissioner Campbell asked if the noise consultant had based his study on the wall being open on the west side.

Mr. Michaud noted the consultant knew it would be open at times. There was discussion on the direction of potential noise and the viewing deck. Mr. Michaud ended that staff would get clarification on this information and report back, along with clarification on the use of the pool viewing deck.

Mr. Michaud reviewed setbacks. He noted that the project is in compliance with the Special Use Permit guidelines with the exception of the proposed villas near the west property that will match the other existing one-story guest units at a 65-foot setback versus the 100-foot guideline and the main lodge with some covered areas at a 94-foot setback and the porte-cochere at a 34-foot setback. No specific comments or question were noted.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the circulation, traffic, and parking.

Chairman Rose noted that at the neighborhood meeting the previous night, residents expressed concern about the entrance off Indian Bend Road. The applicant stated that all signage and the main entrance would be off Scottsdale Road at the traffic light. However, Chairman Rose wanted to make people aware that the residents present had concern about the egress and ingress off Indian Bend Road.

Mr. Michaud stated these concerns centered on construction and access, noting that the applicant assured construction access would be primarily from Scottsdale Road. He also noted that there was a traffic light at the main entrance which is and will continue to be the main access point. He described the future roundabout at Indian Bend Road required as part of a different development.

Mr. Michaud provided an update on the traffic analysis for the project. He mentioned that the applicant had addressed the concerns raised by the Town's third-party reviewer, and the report was expected to be approved soon. He stated that there were no proposed warrants for improvements based on the project, but the roundabout, which was part of the Palmeraie development, was already in the works. He also mentioned the draft stipulations such as

rededication of the existing rights-of-way, the applicant coordinate with others on planned off-site street improvements, construction-related easements, and requirements on fire lanes.

Commissioner Liepmann asked what it meant to rededicate a right-of-way.

Mr. Michaud replied that the Town on older county dedications ask the owner to rededicate the right-of-way to remove any ambiguity.

The conversation then moved on to the topic of parking.

Commissioner Georgelos asked where the bus and shuttle were located.

Mr. Michaud described the circulation plan for four buses and transportation within a resort. Four buses typically enter through the north entrance along Scottsdale Road to drop off at the porte-cochere. The resort uses golf carts to transport staff and guests around the property. Mr. Michaud reviewed stipulations related to the parking.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the parking guidelines and the proposed parking plan. This included information on how berms are used to screen vehicle headlights, the underground garage was increased to accommodate 88 spaces, the garage and surface parking along Scottsdale Road adjoining the restaurants will be for valet parking only, the proposed parking meets the peak demand of 571 spaces from the parking analysis, and the plan includes an optional valet parking plan that increases the onsite parking to 676 parking spaces (noting the location of 20 of these valet spaces near the Indian Bend Road driveway may be a concern or require screening).

Commissioner Campbell asked a question about the parking spaces compared to the data on the various Town resorts and how they were calculated, whether it was based on the entire development divided by the number of hotel rooms or if it accounted for the varying degrees of ancillary uses such as restaurants, retail, and convention space. He wanted to know if the parking was solely based on the number of hotel rooms or if other factors were considered.

Mr. Michaud explained that the parking spaces per unit relied solely on the total number of units in the resort. He noted that the individual parking analysis that went with each resort took into account the various uses. He cautioned against relying solely on the number of parking spaces per unit number and stated this is why the Town also requires a more detailed parking analysis.

Chairman Rose asked for clarification about valet mode.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the difference between shared and unshared parking.

Mr. Michaud explained that shared parking is when one facility is closed or has

lower demand that guests can use the available spaces from that use .

Commissioner Georgelos asked for the seating capacity of the restaurants. She expressed concerns about the increase in parking demand due to the addition of new restaurants. She believed that not only the resort guests but also external visitors would use the restaurants and questioned the capacity of the new restaurants and the impact of other changes, such as the updated pool area and conference space, on parking demand.

Mr. Michaud stated that the standard practice is to use square footage for parking requirements and not number of seats. He stated he will ask the applicant to provide this information. He also reviewed the table in the parking analysis regarding the percentage assumptions of parking due to offsite vehicles.

Commissioner Locke asked what the maximum capacity of the conference room space. She mentioned that she attends many local conferences where the majority of attendees do not stay at the resort or use rideshare services. She stated that the if the conference room capacity and the allotted parking for conference in the analysis seems off.

Chairman Rose asked about the square footage of the conference space. He finds that the spaces allocated for conference rooms seem undervalued. He estimated that 10,000 square feet of indoor meeting space could accommodate up to 700-800 attendees for dinner, requiring more parking spaces. He also questioned the lack of employee parking, suggesting that 150-200 spaces may be needed for the night shift.

Mr. Michaud replied that employee parking was a point raised by staff and that the modeling of the use's factors in employee parking.

Chairman Rose expressed that he would be more comfortable knowing the number of employees and the indoor square footage.

Commissioner Campbell stated this property was unique because of the surrounding commercial properties. He would like to see valet agreements with a business nearby.

Chairman Rose agreed.

Commissioner Locke wanted to know how they calculated their number for the underground parking lot. She asked if that could be increased.

Commissioner Nassikas asked if there should be designated staff parking.

Commissioner Liepmann stated she wondered how many employees would take the bus.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the items the Planning Commission discussed for the applicant to provide back. This included off-site parking agreements in the event of an atypical parking demand situation, the size of underground parking garage, to break out the employee parking embedded in the parking analysis, and to provide more detail on the assumptions on percentage of parking demand arriving offsite, with focus on the conference areas.

Mr. Michaud next reviewed the landscaping and buffers. He noted that the buffers meet the Special Use Permit guidelines with the following exceptions: Hummingbird Lane is 25 feet in width compared to the 30 feet width in the guideline which is an existing condition not proposed to change, Scottsdale Road north of the main entry has an existing approved buffer between 9 feet and 12 feet that the proposal seeks to match south of the entry and along Indian Bend Road near the proposed restaurants. He continued that the landscape plan is very conceptual.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if they would receive more landscaping details.

Mr. Michaud mentioned that staff requested that the applicant provide more detail regarding the proposed changes along the street frontage. He noted that the applicant preferred to defer this and do it via stipulation, which was not the staff's preference. He then presented a slide showing the blue area where the staff was suggesting more detail.

Chairman Rose noted he attended the Town Council meeting last week, and noted that Council were adamant about a detailed landscaping plan for Andaz, and he thought it would not be different for this project.

Commissioner Liepmann wanted to see a plan of all edges of the resort and not just what was shown in blue on the landscape presentation map.

Mr. Michaud noted no changes are proposed along the west property line that has a block wall and oleander hedge as well as the berm and oleander hedge along the north property line.

Commissioner Campbell requested the detail landscaping along the west property line extend to the proposed guest units.

Mr. Michaud summarized the additional information requested by the Planning Commission for a more detailed landscape plan (plant material, quantity of trees/shrubs, hardscape, specialty paving at driveways, massing of boulders, etc.) along the perimeter of the site in the area enclosed by the blue line in the graphic shown.

Mr. Michaud next discussed the exterior lighting. He noted that the existing lantern-style fixture is the approved fixture from the original Special Use Permit. He explained that the applicant provided a detailed analysis on the existing lighting, but not the proposed lighting.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the lighting was not going to be intensive. Some areas were already flooded with lights, so there was no reason to make them shield those. He noted areas of concern to him.

Mr. Michaud discussed the staff's concerns regarding the applicant's plan and their request for more detail in the landscape and photometric plans. He summarized that the direction is for the applicant to provide a more detailed proposed exterior lighting plan, with a focus on lights visible from off property - specifically along the north and west property lines as these are nearest to residential homes. Similar to the existing lighting analysis provided, the proposed material typically includes a photometric plan based on the proposed site layout to understand fixture location, a table with fixture information (e.g. lumens, quantities, etc.), and cut sheets.

Mr. Michaud moved onto drainage and utilities. He reported that the engineering division reviewed the preliminary plans with no concerns. He described the proposal will add underground storm drains, catch basins, and two underground retention tanks and showed the location of these improvements.

The Planning Commission had some questions that Mr. Michaud addressed to clarify the drainage and utilities.

Mr. Michaud next moved to signage. He explained that the submitted material is too conceptual to adequately evaluate the proposed signs. He stated that the applicant now plans to defer this approval to a later date as a Minor Special Use Permit amendment.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if most of the signage would be facing Scottsdale Road.

Chairman Rose stated that the applicant led them to believe there will be no signage along Indian Bend Road.

Mr. Michaud explained that there was an existing sign at the Indian Bend Road driveway that the proposed conceptual plans show a sign. He continued that other signs include two entry walls with signs on each side at the main Scottsdale Road access, a directional sign in the center, and three building signs facing Scottsdale Road for the restaurants. However, as noted staff requested more details such as sign area, height, lighting, and other specifics. Mr. Michaud noted that the name of the resort was also expected to change.

The Commission agreed it would be fine to defer the signage to a later date.

Mr. Michaud moved onto perimeter walls. He explained that not many walls are proposed or exist. The focus of the discussion was on the two proposed screen walls - the wall at the port-cochere and the wall across from the garage access along Indian Bend Road. The purpose of these screen walls are to hide

unattractive features, but there is not enough detail to review it adequately.

Commissioner Campbell stated he was comfortable with the entry walls being a part of the entry signage review. However, he wanted to see the screen walls at this point.

Mr. Michaud quickly summarized the stipulations.

Chairman Rose asked if there was concern if the owner could not lease the restaurants and if they should have stipulations to ensure they did not look in disrepair.

Ms. Collins responded such a stipulation can be drafted.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the neighborhood outreach done to date. He noted that the items noted during the two neighborhood meetings focused on the scope of the request, background on the owner (Highgate), the amenities to be offered (dining options, whether the restaurants will be leased out (yes), expanded spa options, resort pool), any changes in driveway locations (which there are none), location of the underground parking, parking space supply, completion date (estimated 18 to 24 months after SUP approval), construction phasing and impact to Indian Bend Road, and building heights.

The Planning Commission discussed the timeline of the upcoming meetings for this item.

Chairman Rose at the request of Commissioner Campbell allowed the applicant's parking consultant Paul Basha to address questions.

Mr. Basha responding to the off-site parking agreement replied they had one agreement in hand and would have two more by the end of the process.

Commissioner Campbell's main concern was that unusual events could occur beyond assumptions. He believed that the presence of nearby parking could help to solve some of the issues related to these events, given the unique situation of the location.

Chairman Rose at the request of Brian Brady, a resident, commented that he supported the project. He did not want it to be difficult for the applicant to get approval. There was much going on in the Town. He was burdened by the Ritz Carlton project and was not sure it was an asset to the Town. Since then, he has taken an interest in new projects. He had previously asked the applicant for a rendering of the project. He was concerned with the final look of the project. The artist's impression was strange and a mix of architecture. He wanted a model of what it would look like. He applauded the attention to parking and felt it could be a problem.

It was stated staff would follow up with the applicant about better visuals to

understand the architecture and design theme.

No Reportable Action

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

7. ACTION ITEMS

None

8. CONSENT AGENDA

A. [23-040](#) Approval of the January 17, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Liepmann, to approve the January 17, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

9. STAFF REPORTS

None

10. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

None

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Michaud stated that the next meeting will include the same two items discussed this evening.

12. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Locke at 8:55 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Campbell, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Paul Michaud, Secretary

to the road around the property as a way to control activity on the property.

Commissioner Locke and Mr. Stoutgaard discussed the security and parking regulations at the resort. The expectation is that only registered guests should be at the resort, and if guests are causing problems, they will be asked to leave. There are two parking spaces per unit, and overnight occupancy is limited. Mr. Stoutgaard wanted to control the experience, so the guests were happy with their stay.

Jeremy Chandler, resident, stated that he lives on McDonald Drive south of the resort. He expressed his frustration with the continued noise. The screaming and shouting go on every weekend. He added the crowd noise is an issue and his biggest concern since the code addresses amplified noise and not people talking.

Commissioner Liepmann stated that she had the same experience with the noise. The resort employees try to tell the customers to reduce the noise, but it only quiets down for about 15 minutes and then goes back up. She understands that from the business perspective, the primary goal is to ensure that the guests have a good time and want to return in the future. However, the business should consider neighbors living in the area.

Lee Storey, resident, thanked Mr. Stougaard for raising the perimeter wall to 8 feet tall. She lived in her home adjoining the resort for 33 years. She saw different plans on this site. She feels it can work. Noise is an issue with anything. She added that the resort staff will go out and noise many times quiets down but starts back up. She feels the neighbors end up enforcing the noise and not the resort.

Mr. Stougaard stated that the resort has existed for many years and that he's trying to be as sensitive as possible to the neighbors. He's trying to do something that works for everybody.

Commissioner Liepmann stated that she was concerned that the drainage plan could affect the southern property.

Mr. Stougaard noted that the southern property wouldn't be affected because the plan calls for underground storage tanks.

Mr. Burton stated that this item would be brought back before the Commission on January 3, 2023.

No Reportable Action

B. [22-347](#)

**Discussion of Scottsdale Plaza Intermediate Special Use Permit
7200 N Scottsdale Road (SUP-22-02)**

Mr. Michaud provided an overview of the item, covering the scope of the request, Statement of Direction, uses, and areas of the proposal not meeting the Special Use Permit (SUP) Guidelines.

Commissioner Campbell asked for a definition of "big sister" related to the guest room building.

Mr. Michaud replied that this is a temporary place-holder term, not an industry term.

Commissioner Campbell asked about the height of the enclosed pool viewing deck.

Mr. Michaud replied that the building has two stories and it's 30 feet tall. The viewing deck is about 15 feet tall.

Commissioner Liepmann asked if there is an additional event space south of the meeting center.

Mr. Michaud stated that the location of the new event lawn will be south of the main lodge in the area of the current parking lot which is north of the main Scottsdale Road access

Commissioner Georgelos inquired about the distance of the nearest residences.

Mr. Michaud replied that the closest house to the area of improvements is along the north side of Hummingbird Lane and approximately 250 feet away.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about limits on amplified music from the proposed viewing deck and the opening of the sliding doors.

Mr. Michaud replied that staff is drafting stipulations, including a limitation on these areas, and the event space will primarily be used for receptions.

Commissioner Campbell suggested not having operable windows on the north façade of the viewing deck to address any potential concerns with nearby residences.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the proposed improvements starting in the southeast quadrant at Scottsdale Road and Indian Bend Road which will see the most changes to the northwest quadrant having no changes expect for painting the exterior of the existing buildings and renovating the interiors of these buildings.

Commissioner Covington asked if the resort had its own laundry on site.

Mr. Michaud replied that he believed it did, and will follow up.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the proposed density, lot coverage, and floor area ratio. The resort meets the guidelines for lot coverage and total area impervious but may be slightly over the guideline for lot coverage at 25.7%.

Commissioner Locke asked if the staff is not concerned about the additional units because they are still below 60% of all impervious area.

Mr. Michaud replied that the size and location of the site, as well as the fact that most of the buildings are single story with some two-story structures, contribute to the ability of the site to handle the proposed density.

Commissioner Campbell asked if it would be possible to get similar data for other resorts in the Town.

Mr. Michaud replied that he has a graph and table with data for other resorts he will provide at the next meeting but notes that the numbers are estimates and should be taken with caution, but will show trends.

Mr. Michaud and the Commissioners discussed the site's height, setback, and orientation of new structures. They also talked about the visibility of the buildings, the impact of the two tallest buildings on the site, and the privacy and noise levels for adjacent residents. The existing perimeter setbacks for the site were discussed, as well as the service structures and accessory structures, including three restaurants. Furthermore, Mr. Michaud discussed the lighting and the existing non-compliant light fixtures.

Mr. Michaud further described the underground parking garage, retention basins, and underground basins that will be added to ensure compliance with the Town's standards. He also mentioned that the access points will remain the same and that the interior drive will still have a loop. However, the parking will be reduced from 738 to 547 spaces, with a guideline of 1.2 spaces per unit (which the proposal meets at 1.2 spaces per unit).

Commissioner Locke expressed concern about the decrease in parking.

Mr. Michaud clarified that the restaurant parking would be reserved for valet only and not open to the public. He discussed the square footage of the meeting space, which is currently 41,346 and will be reduced to 34,005 after the proposed changes.

Commissioner Covington asked about the percentage of visitors expected to be from the resort.

Mr. Michaud stated that he did not have that information at this time.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the landscaping.

Mr. Michaud stated that the proposed landscaping should be able to soften the restaurants.

Commissioner Campbell raised concerns about the guideline of 1.2 parking spaces per unit being oversimplified and wanted to make sure that the 547 parking spaces would be sufficient for all the different uses of the resort. He inquired about the restaurants and if they will mostly be open for lunch and dinner, and the existing restaurant, CJ's, will remain but with a different concept.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that she was concerned about the parking situation at the location due to the addition of new uses such as restaurants, a spa, and other changes. She believed that the underground parking may not compensate for the increased demand and did not want there to be a parking problem in the future.

Mr. Michaud stated that parking will be discussed by the Commission at a later time.

No Reportable Action

C. [22-374](#) Verizon Wireless Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at Camelback Inn Resort & Spa - 5402 E Lincoln Drive

Mr. Burton provided an overview of the item, covering the background, scope, and next steps. He stated that the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum setback of 200 feet from the nearest dwelling unit, but two of the three sectors will encroach on this limit. However, the Ordinance allows the Commission to modify requirements. He continued that the staff supports the encroachments because they do not increase the height of the building, blend in with the design, and comply with all other requirements. The Commission had previously approved a similar request for T-Mobile in the same area on this ballroom building. The proposed antennas and radio heads will be concealed behind existing parapets or new screens that match the existing building and will not cause any negative impacts such as odor, noise, vibration, smoke, or heat. The applicant has provided a report demonstrating compliance with federal requirements. The Commission will review and consider the proposal at its meeting on January 17, 2023.

Commissioner Covington asked for clarification on the difference between an antenna and radio head.

Graham Chapman, a site acquisition specialist with Verizon, explained that an antenna distributes the wireless signal, and a radio head helps transfer it.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the purpose of the facility.

Mr. Chapman explained that it was to increase the capacity in the area.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the potential for interference with other frequencies.

Mr. Chapman explained that they follow federal guidelines to prevent interference.

Commissioner Covington asked about the distance between the antennas, and Commissioner Liepmann asked about the locations of the existing antennas.

Mr. Burton reviewed these on the site plan. The Verizon antennas are in three different areas of the building, while T-Mobile antennas are located near each of the Verizon antennas. He indicated that the Verizon antennas are in the darker