



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

Tuesday, January 22, 2019

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

Special Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Wastchak stated there would be three items for discussion that evening. First, a discussion of the Major Special Use Permit Amendment for Mountain View Medical Center; second, a discussion of the Major Special Use Permit Amendment for the Smoke Tree Resort, and third, a discussion of a Preliminary Plat and Private Road Conditional Use Permit for a 3-lot subdivision. He then introduced Council member Moore as the new Vice Mayor and liaison for the Planning Commission.

Vice Mayor Moore stated the Council is looking forward to working with the Planning Commission and that they can let him know if they need anything.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Town Attorney Andrew M. Miller
Community Development Director Jeremy Knapp
Senior Planner Paul Michaud
Planner George Burton
Town Engineer Paul Mood

2. ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Commissioner Daran Wastchak
Commissioner James Anton
Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Orme Lewis
Commissioner Jonathan Wainwright

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

A. [19-014](#)

Discussion of Major Special Use Permit Amendment (SUP-18-12)
10555 N Tatum Boulevard - Mountain View Medical Center

Paul Michaud stated that they have discussed this item before and today they will be focusing on landscape, infrastructure, utilities, traffic, parking and circulation. He added that comments that have been sent in are included in the packet, except for the new ones which were e-mailed out to each Planning Commissioner.

Chairman Wastchak thanked people for being there and being involved. He mentioned that there will not be public comments tonight but encouraged them to continue sending in their written comments.

Mr. Michaud stated the site location is at the southeast corner of Tatum Boulevard and Shea Boulevard. The project is to demolish all the buildings and do a phased reconstruction. He reviewed the resident petition from neighbors against the project regarding health and safety, traffic, aesthetics, length of construction, parking and other concerns. He added that the applicant provided the standard hours which are Monday through Friday 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and Saturday 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. There would, however, be variances with urgent care and the pharmacy. He continued that the applicant is also re-evaluating the placement of the sleep centers, the outdoor employee area, drop off areas, sign elevation and other points noted at the last study session. He also noted the nearest veterinary practice is located one mile north on Tatum Boulevard, the nearest urgent care is across the street on Shea Boulevard. The applicant still needs to schedule the citizen review meeting.

Mr. Michaud stated that looking at landscaping the Statement of Direction (SOD) states attention shall be paid to landscaping along Tatum Boulevard and the southeast side of the property. He then reviewed the existing street landscaping. The proposed plan does reduce the existing street frontage landscape areas. The proposed widths for landscaping vary from approximately 29 to 42 feet from the property line. Full landscape plans the applicant provided are in their packets. Trees and shrubs comply with Town guidelines on the Visually Significant Corridors (VSC) plan. He added that the applicant needs to clarify the use of split rail, stone veneer, and rustic pavers per the VSC plan.

Chairman Wastchak stated he wants to see the hardscapes so that they know they will comply, unless someone from the Commission objects. There was no objection.

Mr. Michaud stated that the current and proposed rear yard landscape area is 25 feet wide which is less than the 40 feet width guideline. The applicant proposes to add landscaping with additional trees and shrubs. He noted

that the Zoning Ordinance allows up to an eight-foot tall wall.

Chairman Wastchak asked if they had heard anything from residents wanting height changes. Mr. Michaud responded that he has not heard anything directly on that point.

Commissioner Lewis stated that this is a significant piece of property and they need to keep the big picture in mind rather than what specific landscaping is going to go in. Whatever gets redeveloped on that property, must be a development they can take pride in.

Commissioner Wainwright commented that he would be concerned if they were wanting to reduce anything.

Chairman Wastchak stated the buffer along the residential is not greater, but not diminished either. He then asked Commissioner Wainwright if his concern is if there will be a reduction of landscaping along Tatum Boulevard and Shea Boulevard.

Commissioner Wainwright responded possibly. If there is a tradeoff to improve the residential buffer than that could work.

Commissioner Georgelos stated this is a completely new development, and that it should not have to be grandfathered. She expressed her feelings that the development should be held to the Town's landscaping guidelines. She added that the wall should be spruced up and consistent with the rest of the design and increased to 8-feet tall.

Chairman Wastchak asked if there were portions of the wall that were not eight feet tall.

Mr. Michaud responded that there were.

Chairman Wastchak stated that Commissioner Georgelos' recommendation about the wall is a good one.

Commissioner Anton commented that he would still like to hear from the applicant about shutting the rear driveway access at night, so that people are not cutting through the site. He would also like to hear feedback from the neighbors about adding trees.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he agrees with Commissioner Georgelos that this is a completely new development and it needs to be up to current standards and guidelines especially on the buffer between the neighborhood and the development.

Commissioner Covington stated he agrees with everything the other Commissioners have said. He clarified that he would be more willing to give on the street sides since that is a commercial corner.

Commissioner Lewis stated he would not like to have an 8-foot tall wall in his backyard.

Commissioner Wainwright stated for the most part he agrees, but the property is triangular and feels there may need to be some give and take.

Chairman Wastchak noted that the Commission is not asking for changes to the proposal along Tatum Boulevard and Shea Boulevard, the direction is for a 40-foot buffer between the development and the neighborhood.

Commissioner Covington asked if the drawings which showed a 3-foot to 4-foot tall wall around the property at the street. Mr. Michaud responded yes in spots at 3-foot tall.

Mr. Michaud stated the next topic was infrastructure and utilities. He then identified some of the existing infrastructure and utilities and noted the applicant submitted a water service impact study. The proposed infrastructure and utilities include the typical construction related utility improvements. The conceptual drainage plans have been submitted and final versions will be submitted with the building permit stages. He added that the Town Engineer could explain further details on infrastructure and utilities if needed.

Chairman Wastchak asked if Paul Mood had a chance to look at the drainage plans.

Mr. Mood responded that he has spoken with the applicant and they have a robust drainage plan which includes a series of retention basins as well as underground tanks and dry wells. He replied that he finds the plans acceptable.

Mr. Michaud addressed traffic, parking, and circulation. A traffic impact analysis was filed. It showed that most nearby intersections operate at a Level of Service D or better. The Tatum Boulevard/Shea Boulevard intersection is worse during the evening commute and each day there are a little under 25,000 vehicles traveling on Tatum Boulevard and a little under 32,000 traveling on Shea Boulevard. He then gave the proposed traffic, which included a project increase of 539 vehicles on Tatum Boulevard and 268 vehicles on Shea Boulevard each day.

Commissioner Lewis asked how often the striping is redone. Mr. Michaud responded that Phoenix does it, but he will contact them about it.

Mr. Michaud stated that the existing parking meets the Special Use Permit (SUP) parking requirements. The proposed parking does not meet the SUP guidelines. He then asked if the Commission supports the parking analysis reduction as well as the parking space dimensions.

Chairman Wastchak asked how it is a reduction when they are bumping it up from 365 to 402.

Mr. Michaud responded they are increasing the number of spaces, but they are not meeting their guideline for parking.

Commissioner Wainwright asked if there is a breakdown of covered versus not covered parking.

Mr. Michaud replied that there are, but he does not have that information with him. He believes the percentage to be about 21% covered.

Commissioner Wainwright asked if he had the location of the parking.

Mr. Michaud responded that it is the gray colored areas on the site plan.

Commissioner Wainwright asked the applicant if there is doctors parking.

John Bozzo, applicant, replied the covered parking.

Commissioner Lewis asked if the parking analysis considers the nature of the practice since the guidelines maybe ten years old.

Mr. Michaud stated the Town updated the guidelines about seven years ago and as a comparison Phoenix and Scottsdale have more generous guidelines per square foot than the Town guidelines.

Commissioner Lewis reiterated that the nature of the development has some unusual aspects.

Mr. Mood stated he reviewed the parking analysis. He added that he has gone out there a few times at different parts of the day and has found there is always quite a few parking spots available. He clarified that it also depended on the office, but overall, he is fine with the reduction.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that they are looking at things in today's uses, but the development will be something with substantially higher

density. She asked Mr. Mood if he is still confident that this parking plan will still be sufficient.

Mr. Mood responded that he is confident on the findings in the parking analysis.

Chairman Wastchak clarified that people may not be able to park right in front of the office they want, but there will be parking available. He then stated he had a few questions on traffic. Right now, the level of service will be about the same, but he is concerned with potentially more back up.

Dawn Cartier, traffic engineer for the applicant, stated they have not run a simulation. She then stated they could run a simulation, and look at queuing based on how many cars are there. They like to look at both to get the most accurate information. Today the volume calculation has queuing on the north bound left as 525 feet divided into two lanes. She noted that all their analysis used signal timing provided by the City of Phoenix.

Chairman Wastchak stated that the City of Phoenix sets the timing on those lights. The lights add to the potential back up on Tatum Boulevard. He then asked if bus bays and deceleration turn lanes into the property are something that deserve further consideration since there are currently none in the plan. He added that they might also consider a signal at Beryl Avenue, which is a City of Phoenix issue.

Ms. Cartier responded the volume on Tatum Boulevard is significantly high, but they would look for about 70 cars turning left to meet the threshold for adding a light and the study is not showing that at this time. She explained that it would not be likely to get the approval from the City of Phoenix to put a signal at Beryl Avenue.

Commissioner Anton expressed his thoughts that the Town should encourage the developer to put as many covered parking spots as possible nearer the residences to reduce the number of trips taken along the rear access driveway.

A discussion ensued about where would be best to place the parking stalls for the development.

Ms. Cartier discussed a recommendation from the traffic study to add a deceleration lane northbound at Beryl Avenue. She clarified that it would be within the existing right-of-way and would require a restriping of the road.

Chairman Wastchak asked about the impact that would be created on the bus lanes and whether there would need to be a pullout lane for buses.

Ms. Cartier responded they will be running simulations and they can include the bus line and see if that would make a change to traffic.

Commissioner Wainwright commented that he does not want to see a bus stop right next to the property on Tatum Boulevard.

Mr. Knapp stated it is best practice to put the stop on the other side of the intersection, so it is not blocking the signal.

Mr. Campbell asked what effect vehicle sharing might have on traffic and parking.

Ms. Cartier responded they are not seeing a reduction in traffic, but they are seeing a reduction in parking.

Ms. Georgelos asked if they are seeing designated areas for *Lyft* and *Uber* and if that will become standard practice.

Ms. Cartier stated it is becoming standard practice in urban areas. She has not seen it in commercial or office related developments.

Ms. Georgelos asked if there is anything they are missing in terms of trying to fix traffic issues.

Ms. Cartier responded the biggest change to make the intersection operate better would be signal timing with the City of Phoenix.

Mr. Michaud stated some residents mentioned keeping in mind restricting U-turns for people coming out of *Fry's*.

Chairman Wastchak stated that might be due to signage which would be under the City of Phoenix.

Mr. Michaud stated that under circulation they have three access points and there are no changes to that in their current application.

Commissioner Wainwright commented that he recalls that there was something strange about where Beryl Avenue connects to Tatum Boulevard, and at this point they have the ability to change that if they wanted.

Mr. Michaud responded that this segment of road was plated as a public roadway with Firebrand Ranch.

Mr. Campbell asked what year they got building permits.

Mr. Michaud responded in the early 1980's.

Mr. Campbell asked when it was developed.

Mr. Michaud responded the early 1980's as well. He then stated future discussion points include height/viewsheds, architectural design, signage, SUP stipulations. He also showed a tentative schedule for when the next meetings would be including the tentative hearing for March 5, 2019.

No Reportable Action

- B.** [19-022](#) Discussion of Major Special Use Permit Amendment (SUP-18-05)
7101 E Lincoln Drive - Smoke Tree Resort Study Session #5

Indexes: Smoketree Resort

Mr. Knapp stated staff received some updated plans on January 9, 2019 that have been included in their packets and one updated sheet that shows changes to height setbacks which he received on Friday. He then reviewed a summary of the request. He continued stating that the revised site plan shows the applicant removed the dumpsters at the northeast corner of the site and added the employee break area to the southeast corner of the site.

Mr. Knapp addressed traffic and parking. This Thursday the Town Engineer will make a recommendation for Lincoln Drive to the Council.

Chairman Wastchak asked which recommendation was going to be shown to them in the illustration.

Mr. Knapp responded it closely aligns with Recommendation 1. He indicated that the Town Code identifies 25 feet from centerline on Quail Run Road and 65 feet on Lincoln Drive for the right-of-way. There is a request to use right of way for landscape buffers and parking. He noted that full dedication of both Lincoln Drive and Quail Run Road is approximately 25% of the site. The applicant is also open to full dedication if relief is given from other Special Use Permit (SUP) guidelines.

Chairman Wastchak asked Mr. Knapp if he would be covering signage along Lincoln Drive today.

Mr. Knapp responded that he will cover signage later in the presentation.

Chairman Wastchak stated that when he looked at signage there were several on Lincoln Drive that were in the 60-foot dedication.

Mr. Knapp then showed the plans for the 25-foot right-of-way on Quail Run

Road which also includes full improvements to both sides of the road.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if the idea is to leave it as is but have the dedication in place.

Mr. Knapp responded that this shows improvements on both lanes from Lincoln Drive all the way to the southern driveway.

Commissioner Georgelos asked whether there will be two lanes.

Mr. Knapp responded that was correct.

Commissioner Campbell asked what happens when the issues are resolved in that area.

Mr. Knapp replied one concern he saw with the location is that if it does fall in the Quail Run right-of-way and the road continues further down there will be issues with the location of the employee break area.

Chairman Wastchak asked for clarification of the western extent of their improvements.

Mr. Knapp responded the road will be centered on the centerline of the road. There will be 11-foot improvement on each side of the centerline and 2 feet of curb on each side. That is 26 feet in total width.

Commissioner Lewis asked if drainage was an issue.

Mr. Knapp replied that they do not have a drainage report for the project yet.

Chairman Wastchak commented that when he looks at the 25 feet he is not seeing how the western and eastern sides are equal.

Mr. Knapp replied that the plan is not an engineer drawing and it may not look centered in the image, but he believes the intention is for it to be centered. He added they can make sure it is a stipulation. He then stated that he has stipulations that are currently being reviewed by staff which will be available at the next meeting.

Mr. Knapp continued sharing the layout of the underground parking area. He noted that the resident area has controlled access.

Commissioner Lewis asked what the plan is for ventilation in the parking garage.

Mr. Knapp responded that they do not have that level of detail yet. He then stated they are proposing 9-foot by 18-foot parking spaces with two-foot overhang. They also show the underground retention location in the plan. The plan includes 75 surface spaces and 120 public spaces and 57 resident spaces underground.

Commissioner Campbell asked if there was any reason the parking structure could not be moved further to the south or to the east on the southern portion.

Mr. Knapp replied that he does not know of any reason that would prevent them from moving the western or southern wall.

Commissioner Covington asked if there are only two or three accessible parking spots.

Mr. Knapp responded he believes there are seven. He clarified there are four more on the main level.

Commissioner Covington asked if the yellow squares are elevators.

Mr. Knapp responded it is a combination of both an elevator and stairs.

Commissioner Anton stated it is strange they are proposing 30 units and 57 parking spaces and not 60 parking spaces.

Mr. Knapp responded that their guidelines say 2 per unit, which would be 60. He added that he is not sure how the spaces will be allocated. He stated that the next item is setbacks. The revised setback shows they have pulled back the 44-foot height further off Lincoln Drive. The 44-foot height has also been setback an additional 16 feet on the south and east sides. He added that on the west side there is a similar setback.

Commissioner Lewis asked if they have been given a compelling reason to go over 36 feet in height.

Mr. Knapp stated they could go down to 36 feet with a different roof design, but the preferred roof design goes up to 44 feet. He added that most of the height above 36 feet is driven by mechanical screening and roof structure.

Commissioner Lewis asked about the certain architectural elements that go up to 48 feet.

Mr. Knapp responded there are elements such as chimneys and columns that exceed 44 feet. He added they would want to include a stipulation on

what could exceed the 44 feet.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if they could see the different roof designs that would comply with the 36 feet. She added that she would prefer a design that complies.

Mr. Knapp replied they could ask the applicant to provide an example of what that might look like.

Chairman Wastchak stated he is concerned with what this will look like from the casitas on the north side and the height on the south boundary. He added that he feels the picture on page 28 is disingenuous. He continued that he has a problem with the plans encroaching in on the open space criteria. They have also heard from the neighbor on the south side who is also not ok with them pushing density on the south property line.

Commissioner Georgelos commented that what they are looking at is putting way more density on a five-acre parcel than what is on a 20-acre parcel right next to it, and that concerns her. She feels this is moving in the wrong direction and it needs to be scaled back.

Commissioner Campbell and Commissioner Covington stated they agreed with Commissioner Georgelos.

Mr. Knapp clarified that at the Council meeting on Thursday they will request an extension from February 6, 2019 to March 6, 2019. He noted that the applicant has agreed to this extension.

Chairman Wastchak asked the Commission if they agree that they are not as concerned with them going into the open space on the eastern boundary.

Commissioner Covington stated he would still rather not see a 44-foot wall on the eastern side.

Chairman Wastchak commented that a setback would be nice.

Commissioner Wainwright clarified that the top floor is all a for-sale product.

Commissioner Anton asked if it was normal for a resort to have 41% of it be made up of sold condos. He is concerned that it is taking on more of a condo project than a resort.

Mr. Knapp stated he would report back on that point.

Commissioner Georgelos commented that she feels it is inconsistent to have for sale condos be such a big portion of the property.

Chairman Wastchak stated that his understanding was that the condos would not be in a rental pool. This resulted in a discussion on rental pool versus rental program and these units having the same furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FF&E) as the resort units.

Chairman Wastchak commented that he is concerned that years from now many of the units will have people living in them and will not be a part of the rental program.

Commissioner Campbell stated he is more concerned that it looks like a resort than what percentage is for sale. He added that if they can get them FF&E and have designs that encourage them to be for more transient use than a full-time home.

Commissioner Georgelos commented that the applicant could scale back the condos.

Chairman Wastchak stated that the applicant may decide to scale it differently and if there are adjustments they will have to come back to explain the adjustments.

Mr. Knapp showed what the units would look like and stated samples were included in their packets on page 21. He then explained the lot coverage is 34% and the floor area ratio is 62%. Mr. Knapp then shared the SUP guidelines for signage and showed the current plans for signage on the site.

Chairman Wastchak stated the bottom sign on the right is in the 16-foot dedication.

Mr. Knapp responded that in the site plan on sheet 13, it shows a shift in the parking.

Chairman Wastchak commented that he wants to make it clear no structures should be in the 16-foot right-of-way dedication.

Chairman Wastchak asked the applicant could provide them with elevations of the signs and which way they are facing. He then asked where the signage stands relative to the guidelines.

Mr. Knapp responded that with the current detail it is hard to say if they are

complaint or not. He then stated that some of the outstanding items are final traffic, circulation, and parking study to be updated, which he expects to have next week. They also need a drainage report, water impact service study, and other SOD items such as landscaping and infrastructure.

Chairman Wastchak asked if the third-party traffic consultant will weigh in on the traffic study.

Mr. Mood responded they will.

Mr. Knapp shared the tentative schedule.

No Reportable Action

C. [19-024](#)

Discussion of a Preliminary Plat & Private Road Conditional Use Permit (PA-17-01 and CUP-19-01)

Sanctuary II - Three Lot Subdivision with Private Road

4474 E. Valley Vista Lane (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 169-20-122) and

4490 E. Valley Vista Lane (Assessor's Parcel Numbers 169-20-123)

George Burton introduced the item and reviewed what the request is and background information. Part of the history included that 4474 Valley Vista was graded without approval in 2016. He believes the grading was done by the current owner.

Chairman Wastchak asked what the Town's position was when that happened.

Mr. Miller stated it was a violation of Town Code, since you need a permit. Typically, what happens is a notice of violation and stop work order is given to the property owner. Staff also typically asks the owner to restore the grade back.

Chairman Wastchak asked about pushing dirt into a wash.

Mr. Miller responded that would also be a violation of Town Code.

Chairman Wastchak asked if it would be more than a violation of Town Code.

Mr. Miller replied that it could violate state law or common law as well.

Chairman Wastchak asked when the Commission will deal with this matter.

Mr. Knapp commented that whether the application came forward or not, the engineering department will be following up with the owner toward restoring the grade on the site.

Mr. Burton shared more of the request summary and it was clarified that the existing home is on Lot 3.

Commissioner Covington asked what the difference is between this and a flag lot.

Mr. Burton responded that on a flag lot the road will be included in the property, but in this case the property and private road way are separate parcels.

Commissioner Campbell stated that his experience is that the Town has always had a full cul-de-sac dedication instead of an alternative turn-around design.

Mr. Burton stated that the preliminary plat meets the minimum lot size, width and setback requirements. He noted that it also passes the standard which requires a 165-foot circle in each lot and touch the 40-foot setback.

Mr. Miller clarified that the circles are to help keep the lots regular in shape.

Mr. Burton showed the preliminary grading and drainage plan. He then went over utilities including who would service their electric, water, and sewer. He noted the owner will have to get a technical appeal from the City of Phoenix to build a structure over their sewer line prior to recordation of the plat. He then shared information on drainage including that grading and drainage plans will be required for each lot individually.

Chairman Wastchak commented that the rendering includes a bridge, but that will need to be approved by the City of Phoenix before it is done.

Mr. Burton responded yes, referring to the technical appeal.

Chairman Wastchak stated they received a letter which addressed a concern with how the rendering did not show how they would deal with water coming off Lot 2, but the grading and drainage plans shows the applicant addressed that point.

Mr. Mood stated he looked at the plans, but the details will come when they submit the building permits. Right now, they are required to dedicate large washes for runoff, and they will have to do drainage reports for those as well.

Chairman Wastchak asked how the neighbor can be informed and reassured that this drainage will not cause them more problems.

Mr. Mood responded that the drainage plans have to go through a building committee and concept design review and neighbors within a 1,500-foot radius will be informed of that meeting and can voice any concerns they have then. These properties will also have to do a hillside safety review and a formal hillside building review as well.

Chairman Wastchak stated that he was glad that neighbors were voicing their concerns. He added that their purposes are mainly to determine lot split and the private road deviation.

Commissioner Anton asked what prevents the application from coming back and asking to remove the lots from hillside.

Mr. Miller stated that the site is marked as hillside on the map, requiring Council approval to remove the site from hillside.

Mr. Burton reviewed fire protection which included requirement for fire department access and fire hydrant spacing/location. A fire hydrant will have to be added. The water flow rate is compliant with code and the new homes built are required to have fire sprinklers.

Mr. Burton addressed landscaping. The private road tract is 275 feet long and will have 24 trees and 125 shrubs. Along Valley Vista Lane, which is 150 feet, the applicant will provide 12 trees and 45 shrubs. The next thing he addressed was the private road Conditional Use Permit. The proposed road is compliant with the 50-foot width, but the deviation is from the cul-de-sac standard to have a hammerhead design. This design will still follow traffic and fire safety standards, and the lots may not meet the one acre minimum if the applicant does the cul-de-sac design.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he does not support the proposed turn-around design because he feels it can cause problems and potentially safety issues.

Commissioner Lewis stated he agrees with Commissioner Campbell.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he feels the only way to do the plat is by not having a cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if there are any other options for them to get a cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Covington stated that the challenge they have is if a vehicle goes down that slope you would have difficulty backing up out of it with any

sort of trailer.

Mr. Miller stated for the public safety aspect, there needs to be adequate room to turn a fire truck around. There have been cases where cul-de-sacs have been required after they did hammerheads. He added that they need a modification, because under the hillside code and under the subdivision code it is required.

There was discussion over different possible designs for a cul-de-sac. This included the applicant purchasing more land from Lot 3.

Commissioner Campbell stated he is completely against the proposed deviation.

Commissioner Anton and Commissioner Lewis agreed with Commissioner Campbell.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that she is fine with the plat if they can show them a way where the cul-de-sac will work.

Commissioner Covington stated if they can create a legal cul-de-sac before the wash he would be acceptable to the application.

Commissioner Georgelos commented provided the cul-de-sac does not impede drainage.

Chairman Wastchak stated that the Mr. Prodanov, engineer for the applicant, could come up and address the Commission.

Mr. Prodanov stated that the project started about 2 years ago. He then gave a history of what happened over that time. They did the turnaround at the end of the road where it is flatter and safer. He noted that the previous Town Engineer supported this design. The Town Planning Division had issues with the design and why they had to go back and dedicate a track. He added that it makes sense to have a big turnaround at the bottom where it is safer and that can be done if the Commission agrees to have this be a dedicated easement like the previous design.

Chairman Wastchak stated his concern is anything that is not a fixed wheel vehicle like a trailer along with the steep slope will be very difficult to maneuver in the proposed space.

Mr. Prodanov responded that this is correct; but asked them to keep in mind this is a private road and a home owners association will be created that can dictate what sort of vehicles can service these properties.

Chairman Wastchak asked about other individuals that might turn down the street and cannot get out.

Mr. Prodanov responded that it is a private road and they can have a no trespassing sign.

Commissioner Wainwright asked if there is a way to physically do a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Prodanov stated the wash and its location is a bit of a challenge, but they could certainly go back to the drawing board.

Mr. Burton stated the plans for retaining walls are compliant with code. There will be nine retaining walls varying from 1.5 feet to 7.5 feet tall. The color of the walls and the bridge will have to comply with the hillside code requirements. To be sure they comply with the hillside code, the Commission can require the applicant to provide the material for review or they can stipulate it to go through hillside committee review prior to construction.

Chairman Wastchak stated he is inclined to leave it to hillside committee review.

Mr. Burton shared images of potential design plans for the development.

Chairman Wainwright asked if they could have gates at the entry points.

Mr. Burton stated that currently as it stands there are no gates. He clarified that they would have to get a Special Use Permit to have gates. He continued stating they will be adding a Tract B which makes Lot 3 not a corner lot and changes the setback. Public comments have been submitted and those will be included in the packet at the next meeting. Some of the concerns in the comments included concern regarding drainage and safety of the hammerhead design.

Commissioner Wainwright asked if the applicant could build the cul-de-sac as one big bridge over the wash.

Mr. Burton responded he believes they could. He then stated that the application is scheduled for a public hearing on February 5, 2019. He noted that this hearing must be continued to comply with timing requirements.

Chairman Wastchak stated all the meetings and their agendas can be

found on the Town website.

No Reportable Action

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

6. ACTION ITEMS

7. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. [19-025](#) Approval of January 9, 2019 Planning Commission Minutes

It was stated to approve the January 9, 2019 minutes at the next meeting since these minutes were not available for review.

8. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Knapp reported that the iPads for the Commission have arrived but have not been set up yet. He clarified that they will not be paperless for the next meeting and if anyone wants a hard copy for the next three meetings staff can provide that.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if there is any flexibility to have hard copies of big plans.

Mr. Knapp responded there will always be access to a hard copy.

9. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

Chairman Wastchak stated that the Council meeting on Thursday has several items that are relevant to the Commission.

Commissioner Campbell stated that whoever is at the meeting for the Smoke Tree Resort extension should make a point about the feelings of the south property owner that came to light at the last meeting.

Mr. Knapp stated he will be the one reporting on that and he will report that both the Commission and applicant are working through the documents and both feel that it is necessary to have more time.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if the applicant has any problems with the extension.

Mr. Knapp responded that they sent an email saying it was acceptable.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Knapp reviewed the future items.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Jeremy Knapp, Secretary