



# Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr  
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

## Minutes – FINAL

### Hillside Building Committee

---

Wednesday, September 17, 2025

8:00 AM

Town Hall Boardroom

---

#### Committee Members

##### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chair Portigal called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

**Present 4 –** Acting Chair Blair Portigal  
Member Sue-Meng Lau  
Member Timothy Dickman  
Member James Rose

**Absent 2 –** Chair Scott Jarson  
Member Robert Brown

#### **STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

Town Attorney Michael Goodman  
Town Engineer Shar Johnson  
Planning Manager Paul Michaud  
Hillside Associate Engineer Juan Gonzalez  
Hillside Planner II Jose Mendez  
Lead Management Specialist Cherise Fullbright

##### 2. EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### 3. APPLICATION REVIEW

#### **A. 25-181 Combined Review for a new shade structure 5937 N La Colina Drive (APN: 164-05-065)**

Mr. Mendez explained that the application was for a shade structure on a property located on the southwest side of town. He stated the existing home was approximately 8,000 square feet, with a floor area ratio of 16%. The proposed structure measured 21 by 18 feet, adding 378 square feet. He noted that the project met side yard setbacks and the structure would be placed on an existing disturbed patio area, measuring 9 feet in height, well below the 16-foot maximum. He described the proposed colors as muted gray and tan, with no new lighting or landscaping included. He concluded that the project met all code requirements.

Acting Chair Portigal asked about the south side which required a setback certification.

Mr. Mendez confirmed the placement, explaining that the initial submission had exceeded the

setback at 17 feet, but corrections had been made to meet the 20-foot requirement.

Acting Chair Portigal thanked him, then checked for further questions or public comments.

**A motion was made by Acting Chair Portigal, seconded by Member Lau, to approve item 25-181 subject to stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 – Acting Chair Portigal, Member Lau, Member Dickman, Member Rose

**Absent:** 2 – Chair Jarson, Member Brown

**B. 25-138 Concept Review for a New Single-Family Residence  
3924 E Bethany Home Road (APN 170-01-006)**

Mr. Gonzales explained that the project involved a 5,757 square foot home and a 1,005 square foot casita on a lot just over one acre. He noted that the total roofed area would be 8,217 square feet, resulting in a floor area ratio of 18.68%, which was below the 25% allowable. He stated that the site had previously been entirely disturbed, so the allowable disturbance was 43,970 square feet, while the applicant proposed 33,251 square feet. He described plans for site restoration, including on-site stormwater retention with basins and conveyance pipes, as well as retaining walls ranging from one to four feet in height, all within the required setbacks. He emphasized that the proposed height of 26 feet 6 inches was below the 40-foot maximum and that the design respected the 24-foot offset plane. He invited the applicant to provide additional details.

Owner Ashton Wolfswinkle, Architect Matt Thomas, and Engineer Nick Prodanov introduced themselves.

Mr. Thomas clarified that the casita shown in earlier discussions was removed from the current submittal but was being considered again in a different location, noting that it was not reflected in the current plans. He also confirmed that the proposed roof was a parapet-style flat roof.

Member Dickman asked if there was an early overview of exterior lighting, observing that renderings did not appear to show examples.

Member Lau thanked the applicants for including the 24-foot overlay, stating it was very helpful. She emphasized that exterior lighting often presented compliance challenges and encouraged careful consideration during later design phases.

Mr. Thomas acknowledged the point and agreed.

Acting Chair Portigal asked about grading and drainage challenges.

Mr. Prodanov explained that offsite flow from the north neighbor was being accepted and routed downstream through a channel to the outfall, improving the current poor containment conditions. He noted that the project would reduce silt on Bethany Home Road and improve landscaping as well as the overall site condition.

Acting Chair Portigal thanked him and concluded by noting that the committee looked forward to reviewing a full set of plans, including lighting, in the future.

**Presentation and Discussion. No Reportable Action.**

**C. 25-185 Concept Review for a New Single-Family Residence  
5712 E Glenn Drive (APN 169-55-026A)**

Mr. Mendez explained that the property, located on Mummy Mountain, had a history of disturbance dating back to the 1980s and multiple variance requests from 2016 and 2021. He noted that the new proposal was for a 6,001-square-foot residence with a 941-square-foot garage on a lot of just over an acre. The floor area ratio was below the 25% maximum at 15.72%. He stated that the home would be 32 feet in height, within the 40-foot limit, but variances tied to the previous plan sets would need to be revisited by the Board of Adjustment. He said the applicant proposed light reflection value compliant materials, including Vulcan steel, wood, masonry, and black metal glazing. Landscaping and lighting plans were not yet provided, which was typical during concept review.

Acting Chair Portigal asked whether the two 2016 variances required revisiting.

Mr. Mendez confirmed that the applicant would need to return to the Board of Adjustment for modifications, outlining specific changes to rear setbacks, side setbacks, retaining walls, and spill slopes compared to what was initially approved. He emphasized that exhibits would be required to show the differences between the old approvals and the new requests.

Acting Chair Portigal asked if the driveway would remain in place.

Mr. Mendez confirmed the driveway would remain.

Commissioner Rose inquired whether notice had been sent to the neighbors and if any comments had been received.

Mr. Mendez replied that notice had been sent for the concept review, and further notice would be provided as part of the Board of Adjustment process.

Brent Kendle, the architect, introduced himself and his associate Richard Van Horn. He described the site as extremely challenging and stated that his team had worked to remain within the spirit of the existing variances. He said some roof overhangs and rear yard extensions exceeded the prior approvals but were in low-visibility areas, mainly to provide privacy. He acknowledged disappointment in needing to return to the Board of Adjustment but said staff appeared supportive. He emphasized his commitment to working within town ordinances, explaining that variances were unavoidable on this lot.

Acting Chair Portigal asked about grading and drainage.

Mr. Prodanov explained that off-site flows from the mountain had historically caused flooding. He said drainage structures were upsized for safety, with underground stormwater storage and trench drains added to capture driveway runoff. He assured that downstream impacts would be reduced compared to current conditions.

Mr. Kendle added that although a landscaping plan had not yet been submitted, they had engaged a landscape architect to restore the spill slope. He said the slope would be cut down and landscaped to make the site more naturalized.

Steven Schaffner, a long-time resident, raised concerns about disturbance levels and asked about additional jackhammering. He described past experiences with years of disruptive jackhammering on nearby projects and urged the committee to consider restrictions or penalties to prevent prolonged disturbances.

Mr. Kendle responded that while some cutting into the northwest wall would be necessary, they had designed the home to minimize jackhammering. He anticipated weeks rather than years of such work and explained that most excavation would involve removing loose fill, not hard rock.

Member Rose asked if an expert could provide better estimates of jackhammering.

Mr. Kendall suggested that an excavator could provide realistic timelines once plans were finalized.

Mr. Mendez stated that geotechnical reports and safety improvement plans would later provide more clarity.

Mr. Gonzales added that neighbors would be notified during the safety improvement plan process and would have a 45-day period to comment or hire an independent engineer. He stated that construction staging plans and timelines would also be required and made available as public records.

Member Lau suggested that applicants prepare a clear summary matrix comparing approved and proposed variances to help reviewers and the public understand the changes. She also stressed the importance of landscaping, storm prevention, and retaining wall materials.

Mr. Kendall agreed and said that such a summary would be prepared for the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Mendez concluded by reiterating that the next step was for the applicant to go through the variance process before the Board of Adjustment, after which a formal review could proceed, depending on the outcome.

#### **Presentation and Discussion. No Reportable Action.**

##### **D. 25-198 Combined Review for a new detached guesthouse 5001 E Cottontail Run Road (APN: 169-08-053)**

Mr. Mendez explained that the existing 9,629 square foot single-family residence on the site had been approved in 2013, along with a guest house that was never built. He stated the lot size was 1.85 acres, with the proposed guest house measuring 1,674 square feet, slightly larger than the 1,200 square feet previously approved. He noted that the floor area ratio would be 14.02%, well below the 25% allowed, and the building pad slope allowed for 26% disturbance. He said the guest house would be located on an existing lawn area and stand 15 feet 4 inches high, with an overall height of 17 feet 11 inches, in compliance with code. He described three wall sconces at 750 lumens each, no new landscaping, and no landscape lighting. He noted the materials would match the existing residence, including Anasazi limestone veneer, Mexican tea paint, brick accents, and a weathered copper metal roof, all light reflection value compliant. He concluded by inviting the applicant to speak.

Jeffrey Kramer, the architect, noted that he was also the project architect when the residence was originally approved and built. He explained that the same owner was now pursuing the guest house that had been planned but not constructed a decade earlier.

Acting Chair Portigal asked whether the wall sconces would match those on the existing home. He also asked about the roof materials.

Mr. Kramer stated they would be similar but not identical. He confirmed the roofing would match, including standing seam metal and clay tile, consistent with the primary residence.

**A motion was made by Acting Chair Portigal, seconded by Member Rose, to approve item 25-198 subject to stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 – Acting Chair Portigal, Member Lau, Member Dickman, Member Rose

**Absent:** 2 – Chair Jarson, Member Brown

**E. 25-184 Combined Review for a Re-design to a previously approved Major Remodel 5228 E Solano Drive (APN 172-47-021)**

Mr. Mendez explained that the proposal involved changes to an earlier approved remodel. He stated that the existing residence was 7,330 square feet. The new proposal increased the total to 11,105 square feet by reallocating garage space to livable area, reducing a four-car to a three-car garage. He noted the lot size was just over one acre, with the floor area ratio already at the maximum allowable. He emphasized that site disturbance would not change, and most of the footprint would remain the same. The new design shifted to flat roofs, raising the first floor and modernizing the look. He stated that the maximum height would be 28 feet in certain areas, with an overall height of 37 feet, within the 40-foot limit, and all sections complied with the 24-foot grade requirement. Materials included grays and tan hues, with light reflection value compliant stones. He also reviewed the updated lighting plan, noting 24 fixtures at 250 lumens and various landscape lighting fixtures well below code limits. He pointed out that some landscape lights needed adjustment to comply with the 10-foot setback requirement, but confirmed that the grading and drainage plan met standards.

Marwan Tamimi, the architect, explained that the house had been redesigned after COVID delayed the original construction. He said he advised his client to adopt a more contemporary style and eliminate sloped roofs, both for aesthetics and to gain height on the first floor.

Acting Chair Portigal asked about the roof and whether the bridge had been enlarged.

Mr. Tamimi responded that the bridge remained unchanged.

Acting Chair Portigal then raised concerns about the number of lights, observing that the plan seemed to include more than 100 exterior fixtures.

Member Dickman also questioned the quantity, pointing to in-ground spotlights and asking where they would be placed.

Mr. Mendez clarified that they would be installed in an outdoor barbecue counter area.

Member Lau asked about the configuration of 78 FX luminaire fixtures, confirming they would be on risers and vertical faces around planters and stairs. She cautioned about the visual effect of so many lights on the south-facing elevation.

Mr. Tamimi replied that the lights pointed downward, which reduced impact on neighbors, but he agreed to reconsider placement if needed.

Member Dickman suggested staggering stair lights to avoid a “runway” effect.

Mr. Tamimi explained that the stairs went downhill, below street elevation, so visibility to neighbors would be minimal.

Mr. Mendez added that some lights would be eliminated due to changes in the driveway and entry area.

Acting Chair Portigal and Member Dickman noted the low lumen levels as a mitigating factor.

Mr. Mendez concluded by suggesting that stipulations could be added to reduce either the number of lights or their lumens if the committee felt it necessary.

**A motion was made by Acting Chair Portigal, seconded by Member Lau, to approve item 25-184 subject to stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 – Acting Chair Portigal, Member Lau, Member Dickman, Member Rose

**Absent:** 2 – Chair Jarson, Member Brown

**A brief recess was taken at 9:17 AM. The meeting reconvened at 9:25 AM.**

**F. 25-182 Formal Review for a Single Family Residence  
6041 E Foothill Drive (APN 169-03-055A)**

Mr. Gonzales explained that the applicant proposed a 13,295 square foot multi-level home on a 1.44-acre lot. He stated the floor area ratio was 21.2%, below the 25% threshold. Since the site had been previously disturbed, the allowable disturbance was greater than the baseline 10.25%, with an existing disturbance of 57.11%. He noted the proposal reduced disturbance to 42.43% through restoration efforts. He outlined plans for on-site retention with pipes, catch basins, check dams, and rip rap swales. Retaining walls would range in size, primarily for erosion control at the rear of the home. He reviewed construction staging, stormwater prevention measures, and restoration of disturbed areas. The maximum building height was 37 feet 6 inches, within the 40-foot code limit, and the design fit within the 24-foot plane. Materials and hardscape were light reflection value compliant. Lighting plans were also reviewed, with staff recommending the removal of certain downlights to avoid lighting vertical surfaces. Landscape lighting met lumen requirements except for three fixtures that would need to be relocated 10 feet from the property line.

CP Drewett, the principal architect, confirmed the home was designed as a split-level rather than three stacked stories and said he was available for questions.

Acting Chair Portigal recalled earlier discussions about relocating the driveway.

Mr. Gonzales explained that the applicant would restore the old driveway area as part of the landscape plan, while the new design improved safety and visibility.

Mr. Drewett added that the redesign addressed safety concerns at a nearby intersection, improved water flow management, and allowed for landscaping around a highly visible utility outpost.

Acting Chair Portigal raised past concerns about drainage.

Mr. Prodanov explained that retention and catch basins were designed to capture and detain runoff, preventing downstream flooding. He emphasized that the project would create less drainage impact than the current conditions.

Commissioner Rose asked about lighting and whether the renderings showing a brightly lit home were accurate.

Mr. Gonzales said the applicant provided photometric studies showing compliance with code and noted that staff required the removal of certain fixtures.

Mr. Drewett stated the renderings were artistic and not technically accurate, and the photometric studies should be relied upon for compliance.

Ken Phelps, a nearby resident, said the project looked positive but expressed concerns about driveway placement, drainage, and construction traffic. He explained that his property had experienced flooding in the past and worried about access issues given other ongoing projects nearby. He also mentioned concerns about mailbox placement and potential disturbances from excavation.

Mr. Drewett reassured him that the new design slowed runoff and reduced the driveway slope. He said construction staging could utilize existing driveways to minimize impacts.

Mr. Prodanov added that water would be detained on site and released only during major storm events, with silt and debris retained.

Mr. Phelps asked about project timing and expressed concern about cumulative impacts from neighboring construction.

Mr. Drewett responded that work would likely begin within the next quarter and emphasized that the builder was also the future owner, giving confidence that the project would be completed efficiently. He stated that he would facilitate direct communication between the builder and neighbors to address concerns about construction traffic and deliveries.

Commissioner Rose stressed the need for oversight of construction traffic, given congestion in the area.

Member Dickman raised concerns about renderings showing a “glass box” effect.

Mr. Drewett clarified that the renderings were not accurate depictions of lighting, whereas the photometric study was precise and included stipulations to remove fixtures creating hot spots.

**A motion was made by Acting Chair Portigal, seconded by Member Rose, to approve item 25-182 subject to stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 – Acting Chair Portigal, Member Lau, Member Dickman, Member Rose

**Absent:** 2 – Chair Jarson, Member Brown

**G. 25-183      Formal Review for a New Single-Family Residence  
5301 E Palo Verde Drive (APN 172-47-016)**

Mr. Gonzales explained that the proposal was for a 7,896 square foot home on a 1.22-acre lot. He stated that the site had previously been heavily disturbed, with 90% disturbance, and that the applicant proposed to reduce disturbance significantly to 39.81%. He reviewed grading and drainage plans, which included catch basins, pipes, rip rap swales, and on-site retention basins designed to maintain natural flows. He noted that the driveway would be shifted from the west to the east side of the property to improve water flow and drainage. He said the applicant completed the 45-day safety improvement plan comment period with no public input. He confirmed the home’s maximum building height was 20 feet 10 inches, with an overall height of 24 feet 10 inches, within the 40-foot limit and 24-foot plane requirements. He stated that lighting consisted of ceiling downlights in covered patio areas, all within lumen limits, though some landscape fixtures in the right-of-way would need to be removed. He said materials complied with light reflection value standards, with the highest being a stone veneer at 30%, and the applicant provided a physical board sample for review.

Nicholas Sotakis, the architect, introduced himself and confirmed the decision to move the driveway was based on both grading and drainage improvements, as well as orienting views to

the northwest.

Mr. Prodanov added that drainage improvements were made wherever possible.

Acting Chair Portigal asked about lighting details.

Mr. Gonzales replied that staff still required full specifications and photos for wall lights, up lights, and path lights.

Member Lau asked about lighting near the pool and spa areas.

Mr. Sotakis responded that patio areas were lit and the pool would have its own underwater lights. He stated that he would review whether landscape lighting was proposed near the pool area.

Member Dickman asked for clarification on pool orientation.

Mr. Sotakis confirmed it was located on the northwest side of the home, facing the street.

**A motion was made by Acting Chair Portigal, seconded by Member Lau, to approve item 25-183 subject to stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 – Acting Chair Portigal, Member Lau, Member Dickman, Member Rose

**Absent:**2 – Chair Jarson, Member Brown

#### **4. STAFF REPORTS**

Mr. Gonzales noted that Chair Jarson would be attending the council meeting next Thursday to provide an update. He stated that a PowerPoint presentation had been prepared to show Town Council an overview of hillside development, consistency of recent projects, and potential code changes.

#### **5. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### **6. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next Hillside Building Committee meeting dates are tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, October 15, 2025, at 8:00 AM and Wednesday, November 12, 2025, at 8:00 AM.


#### **7. ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Acting Chair Portigal, seconded by Member Lau, to adjourn the meeting at 10:15 AM. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 – Acting Chair Portigal, Member Lau, Member Dickman, Member Rose

**Absent:**2 – Chair Jarson, Member Brown

**Paradise Valley Hillside Building Committee**

By:   
Cherise Fullbright, Secretary