



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes – Draft

Planning Commission

*Chair Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Robert Brown
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Craig Curtis
Commissioner Timothy Dickman
Commissioner William Nassikas
Commissioner James Rose*

Tuesday, September 23, 2025

6:00 PM

Town Hall Boardroom

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Chair Georgelos called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Present – Chair Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Robert Brown
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Craig Curtis
Commissioner Timothy Dickman
Commissioner William Nassikas
Commissioner Jim Rose

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Town Attorney Deborah Robberson
Community Development Director Chad Weaver
Planning Manager Paul Michaud
Hillside Planner II Jose Mendez
Lead Management Specialist Cherise Fullbright

2. EXECUTIVE SESSION

3. APPROVAL OR AMENDMENT OF MINUTES

A. 25-168 Approval of June 17, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nassikas, seconded by Commissioner Dickman, to approve the June 17, 2025 meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried with the following vote:

Aye: Chair Georgelos, Commissioner Brown, Commissioner Covington,
Commissioner Curtis, Commissioner Dickman, Commissioner Nassikas,
Commissioner Rose

4. PRESENTATIONS

5. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

Mr. Mendez presented the request to split a single hillside designated lot to create two separate lots. He shared details related to processing, review, and requirements, noting that the four criteria have been met for this request. Mr. Mendez talked about the local roadways including Solano Drive and San Miguel Avenue, landscape improvement requirements which were pending submittal, and the traffic study which was not required. He addressed utilities, drainage, and public comments. He briefly summarized the stipulations.

Commissioner Rose wondered if the retaining wall on the property would remain for erosion during construction or be removed later.

Mr. Mendez stated that the wall would stay in place for retention purposes and the applicant was required to get an encroachment permit for the walls to remain.

Commissioner Dickman requested to see an image of the circle test used to verify lot width. He asked about setbacks.

Mr. Michaud explained that the circle test is when, on a R-43 lot, a 165-foot diameter circle must touch at one point but could encroach within other setbacks and easements so long as it is within the property lines of the lot.

Chair Georgelos requested more information and reasoning as to why the applicant was requesting to defer submission of the right-of-way improvement plan and cost estimate, landscape plan, and assurances documentation as the information seemed critical in making a knowledgeable determination. Chair Georgelos requested the information.

Commissioner Curtis questioned if they were talking about deferring the right-of-way landscape design. He believed deferring this item made sense because the Commission should not push for those improvements before construction is done.

Chair Georgelos stated that the issue was not the construction of the improvements but the Commission not seeing the proposed improvements, which is necessary at this time to make a determination.

Deferral was discussed amongst the Commission and staff.

Commissioner Brown asked if sewer was available.

Mr. Mendez advised that sewer was not available, so both properties would be on septic.

Nick Prodanov, project engineer, was acknowledged by Chair Georgelos. He introduced himself and Drew Bausom with Construction Zone. Mr. Prodanov talked about challenges of the site including erosion and flow diversions which have been accounted for in the design. He explained reasons for keeping the walls on site.

Chair Georgelos questioned how the flows would change for 2 homes versus 1.

Mr. Prodanov responded, stating that the site was not currently designed properly. He added that the historic wash was modified as well as the driveway entrance, and the magnitude of outfall would be smaller than what's seen currently.

Chair Georgelos asked for a plan to show what was described.

Mr. Bausom advised there was no design at this time, which is why the deferral was requested for the right-of-way improvements and landscaping plans.

Commissioner Nassikas asked for details related to scheduling. He determined it was open ended at this time.

Mr. Bausom stated that the owner had no intention of developing the lot but one of the lots would likely be sold and developed on its own.

Mr. Michaud explained that assurances for right-of-way improvements would usually be at the platting or building permit stage, but the typical process, which is not written in code, only requires that there be some way for the assurances to be met, often by stipulation.

Commissioner Dickman asked if each property could be isolated to look at water flows, one lot versus the other.

Mr. Prodanov spoke about the drainage report which details pre-development conditions covering both lots and post-development conditions showing proposed improvements. He explained that every engineer is required to provide proof that the magnitude of the flow and velocity have not been increased. Further, the entry and exit points must remain the same along with the magnitude.

Mr. Michaud stated that a preliminary drainage report was submitted showing an easement. He added that additional details would be presented when a building permit is submitted or the matter goes before the Hillside Building Committee.

Commissioner Dickman wanted to make sure there was a process when the properties come back to the Hillside Building Committee for review.

Mr. Mendez added that each lot would have to go through the safety improvement process as part of hillside review.

Chair Georgelos wanted to see materials. She requested that Mr. Prodanov discuss the drainage map.

Mr. Prodanov discussed grading and drainage including flows, improvements, and retention. He confirmed that Lot 1 would have more challenges.

Commissioner Dickman asked if the Town would require both lots to be developed simultaneously if most of the water runoff came from one lot.

Mr. Michaud was not aware of there ever having been a requirement on the sequencing of lot construction. He briefly spoke about drainage easements on Hillside lots.

Mr. Prodanov spoke about previous projects and designs where drainage ran across a property.

Commissioner Rose sought confirmation that the neighbors have been notified of the project.

Mr. Michaud shared that notice would go out for the public hearing.

Mr. Bausom shared reasons for requesting the lot split as well as details related to demolition, drainage, and improvements. He explained that temporary retention basins were currently being used to maintain the property.

Commissioner Brown wondered if the lot could be split to create two quality, buildable lots given the grade.

Mr. Prodanov confirmed that the lots would be buildable but explained that an architect would have to ensure the design met Town requirements.

Commissioner Rose estimated that it would be difficult to require drainage before structures have been placed on either of the lots. He pointed out it was the purview of the Commission to review the lot split, then additional reviews would be completed as part of the building permit and Hillside Building Committee review processes.

Commissioner Nassikas asked if the property had been platted.

Mr. Michaud noted that the property was part of a subdivision which has gone through a few modifications.

Chair Georgelos asked about the history of the subdivision and what happened to the lot over time. Buildability was also addressed.

Mr. Mendez spoke about the history of the lot including a demolition, restoration efforts, and slope percentages.

The subdivision was discussed amongst the Commission and staff.

Mr. Michaud agreed to find documentation related to the history of the subdivision at the request of Chair Georgelos. He stated that the conceptual site plans included in the packet demonstrate that a home could be built on the lots, so they are buildable.

Chair Georgelos would like to see other materials and would elect not to defer.

Commissioner Dickman noted that it would be helpful to hear neighbor concerns after notification goes out.

Ms. Robberson pointed out that on the last page of the packet, staff sought direction on veering from the typical process to defer the right-of-way plan and cost estimates or not.

Chair Georgelos believed that the requirements were part of the process, and they should not be deferred.

Commissioner Nassikas wondered why staff wouldn't want the assurances in place.

Commissioner Curtis asked if it was written in Town Code that the applicant must have these things done now.

Mr. Michaud explained that it was not written in code, but there must be a procedure for assurances, which is typically done by stipulation.
The general procedure was discussed.

By majority consensus, the Commission expressed a desire to continue staff's general practice of requiring the right-of-way improvement plan and cost estimate, landscape plan, and assurances documentation.

Presentation and Discussion only. No Reportable Action.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS – LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

7. ACTION ITEMS

8. STAFF REPORTS

9. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

Chair Georgelos shared that she gave an update to Council on September 11th about Commission happenings.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Michaud stated that the October 7th meeting was cancelled, so the next meeting would be October 21st where the Commission would act on the item heard this evening.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Commissioner Nassikas, to adjourn the meeting at 7:04 PM. The motion carried with the following vote:

Aye: Chair Georgelos, Commissioner Brown, Commissioner Covington,
Commissioner Curtis Commissioner Dickman, Commissioner Nassikas,
Commissioner Rose

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Cherise Fullbright, Secretary