

1 SUP-15-1
2 Ritz-Carlton Paradise Valley
3

4 -Statement of Direction -
5 June 11, 2015
6

7 On May 4, 2015, the applicant, Five Star Development Resort Communities, submitted a
8 Special Use Permit application to allow for the development of a resort hotel, residential
9 homes, and resort retail at 7000 East Lincoln Drive.
10

11 Section 1102.3 of the Town's Zoning Ordinance states the Town Council must issue a
12 Statement of Direction (SOD) for the Special Use Permit application within 45 days of the
13 first staff presentation. In this case, the Statement of Direction must be issued on or before
14 July 12, 2015.
15

16 The Statement of Direction is not a final decision of the Town Council and does not create
17 any vested rights to the approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP). Any applicant for a Special
18 Use Permit shall not rely upon the matters addressed in the Statement of Direction being the
19 same as those that may be part of an approved Special Use Permit. The Statement of
20 Direction is created to brief the Planning Commission on areas of importance, provide
21 general guidelines for ongoing planning discussions, but may be varied from as
22 circumstances warrant throughout the Planning Commission Review.
23

24 Therefore, the Town Council issues the following Statement of Direction for SUP-15-1, Ritz-
25 Carlton Paradise Valley:
26

- 27 1. The General Plan encourages revitalization and improvement of existing resorts within
28 the Town of Paradise Valley;
29
30 2. The General Plan categorizes this property as a Development Area, intended to focus
31 resort development into targeted areas that are most appropriate for accommodating the
32 variety of land uses associated with such use.
33
34 3. The General Plan further states, Development Areas are meant to encourage new resort
35 development that reflects the Town's needs for fiscal health, economic diversification,
36 and quality of life.
37

38 4. THE PLANNING COMMISSION SHALL REVIEW:
39

40 A. Density

41 Overall density is high with 1,844,650 square feet "occupiable" proposed.

42 Residential and Retail density exceed the Resort Guidelines 25% lot coverage (which
43 may also be understated as the application uses only conditioned space to compute
44 lot coverage). Resort lot coverage is currently at 28.5%.
45

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE June 11, 2015

Page 2 of 6

46 Recommend that all residential and retail density not exceed the 25% lot coverage Resort
47 Guideline (per Area) and that it be measured by total lot coverage, not conditioned space
48 and that overall density shall be reduced.

49
50 Resort lot coverage (Areas "A" and "A1" combined) shall not exceed 30% and 700,000
51 square feet.

52
53 B. Residential lot size

54
55 Areas B and C are detached residential lots. Area C lots are a minimum of 12,000 square
56 feet; Area B lots are a minimum of 9,000 square feet.

57
58 Recommend that all detached residential product in Areas B and C:

- 59
60 1. Have an average of two dwelling units per acre, and
61
62 2. Progress from larger lots on the north, south, and west perimeters to more dense
63 lots in the center and eastern perimeter.
64
65 3. Detached residential product shall be a mix of 1 and 2 story.
66
67 4. Setbacks shall be proposed in a Land density table for all lot types

68 Attached residential housing is proposed for Areas D & E. Attached residential
69 housing as approved and built in other Paradise Valley resorts, are almost exclusively
70 used as resort rental units that are rented through the resort itself (such as is
71 identified for Area A-1).

72 Attached residential product as proposed is disfavored and alternate uses for Area D
73 shall be explored.

74
75 C. Heights

76 Heights far exceed Resort Guidelines' 36' maximum for principal structures and 24'
77 height for accessory structures. Many principal structures are proposed at 48' and
78 some accessory structures are proposed at 36' and 48'. While some additional height
79 may be allotted to provide a transition or buffering from the four-story apartment and
80 three-story office buildings located in the City of Scottsdale, a three-story - 36'
81 maximum was anticipated, stepping down to two and then one-story.

82
83 With the exception of the resort lobby, it is recommended that all four-story/48' tall
84 elements be eliminated and three-story/36' maximum height be considered for principal
85 structures only, and as a buffer along the eastern border.

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE June 11, 2015

Page 3 of 6

86 Grand lobby height is not clear. Application shows up to 22' of fill under the
87 structure with up to 6' of cut through the center of the fill area. Elevations show 22' to
88 47' heights on the resort structure.

89 Recommend that Commission allow such lobby heights to capture the unique
90 mountain views but fully explore the impacts of the proposed height including what
91 is visible off-site and if current views of the Mc Dowell Mountains will be obstructed
92 (as viewed from the adjoining public RsOW). The overall mass of the building shall be
93 reviewed to make sure it is of appropriate scale. A 3-D graphic shall be required. An
94 elevation shall be shown from a benchmark near the intersection of Lincoln Dr. and
95 Mockingbird Lane.

96

97 D. Retail Use

98

99 Retail square footage is proposed at over 160,000 square feet, including a grocery
100 store-type use at 36,400 sf. Although the Resort Guidelines anticipate less retail on
101 standard resort properties, this property is not standard - it is in a designated
102 Development Area and is approximately four times the size of a standard Paradise
103 Valley resort.

104

105 Parcel E shall be evaluated in conjunction with the plans for the Scottsdale Parcel to
106 the east. The applicant shall submit equivalent plans to those submitted for Parcel E
107 prior to the reviews directed below. It is the intent that Parcel E serve as a transition
108 from less intense residential use on the west to more intense mixed use on the east.

109

110 Recommend the Town Council direct Mayor and staff to negotiate agreements with
111 their counterparts in Scottsdale addressing heights, densities, setbacks, uses, traffic,
112 parking, drainage, and revenue sharing should Area E be de-annexed from the
113 proposed submittal.

114

115 Recommend the Paradise Valley Planning Commission evaluate the mixed use submittal
116 with the following conditions:

117

- 118 1. No 4-story/48' height permitted;
- 119 2. Retail must be viable. Staff and commission may request applicant provide a
120 market study addressing the feasibility of the type and amount of retail proposed
121 including the viability of retail located on an interior site. Planning Commission
122 may use a third-party expert to assist in the evaluation of said viability.
- 123 3. Retail must be resort related
- 124 4. Residential must be resort related.

125

126 Recommend the Planning Commission also evaluate the possibility of an all detached
127 residential use of Parcel E if applicant chooses to submit such an alternate.

127

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE June 11, 2015

Page 4 of 6

128 E. Perimeter Setbacks/Open Space

129 Only 25' setback is proposed along portions of Indian Bend, Lincoln, and Mockingbird
130 Lane.

131 No setback is given between the proposed residential product in Area B and the north
132 boundary of St. Barnabas.

133 Interior drives in Areas C & D do not meet 40' setback guidelines.

134
135 Recommend that the SUP Guideline landscape area and buffer be provided. A minimum
136 50' wide landscaped area shall be provided along Lincoln Drive and Mockingbird Roads
137 and a minimum of 30' wide landscape area shall be provided along Indian Bend Road. An
138 additional landscape buffer shall be provided at the corner of Lincoln Drive and
139 Mockingbird Lane, as well as at the main entrance to the Resort and at the gateway to the
140 Town.

141
142 An Open Space Element shall be provided by the applicant. It shall address both
143 private and public open spaces, passive and active recreation, and
144 undeveloped/natural areas. The Resort Guideline for open space is 40%. The
145 Commission shall review this element and also consider landscape buffering as a
146 transition from the large scale development along the eastern border with the City of
147 Scottsdale.

148
149

150 F. Rights-of-Way/Traffic/Parking

151
152 All roadway amenities such as sidewalks, medians, round-a-bouts, deceleration lanes,
153 emergency access points, and traffic/pedestrian signals shall be reviewed and
154 designed to meet Town Engineering Department standards.

155
156 Traffic and Parking Study shall be reviewed.

157
158 Recommend the Commission utilize a Town hired third-party engineer to review the
159 traffic, parking (both above and below ground on both the Town and Scottsdale parcels),
160 and circulation study prepared by the applicant. The review shall include impacts from the
161 proposed development and surrounding development, and traffic analysis on Lincoln Drive
162 from Scottsdale to Tatum.

163
164 Vehicular circulation shall be reviewed. Particular emphasis shall be placed on all ingress
165 and egress points.

166

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE June 11, 2015

Page 5 of 6

167 Lincoln Drive shall be viewed as a “Visually Significant Corridor” in accordance with
168 the General Plan standards and a cross section with a typical landscape treatment
169 shall be reviewed.

170
171 Lincoln Drive is also a Gateway to the Town and special design consideration should be
172 reviewed to reflect this entrance to the Town.

173
174 Recommend that 25’ of Right of Way (ROW) dedication be required along Lincoln
175 Drive. This differs from the 2008 SUP that allowed for a roadway easement. The
176 2012 General Plan has now categorized Lincoln Drive as a Visually Significant
177 Corridor and dedication is requested to allow for development of Lincoln Drive as a
178 Visually Significant Corridor and as a Gateway to the Town. The applicant shall
179 identify setbacks from the post-dedication property line.

180

181

182

183

G. Additional Review Items

184 Landscaping plan will need more detail. Commission shall focus their review on the
185 exterior landscaping along the Rights of Way.

186 Wall master plan must be examined. A meandering alternative shall be explored for
187 the perimeter.

188

189 Monument sign placement and size parameters shall be established.

190

191 Recommend that the Commission utilize a Town hired third-party engineer to review
192 the grading and drainage study prepared by the applicant with emphasis on the
193 necessary retention requirements and the proposed rerouting of the natural wash. A
194 detailed grading and drainage plan for the site will need to be provided that is in
195 conformance with the most current version of the Town of Paradise Valley Storm
196 Drain Design Manual – Subdivision Drainage Design at time of permit submittal.

197

198 Any necessary upgrades for potable water supply shall be explored.

199 Pedestrian and non-vehicular circulation shall be reviewed.

200

201

H. Keys to Success

202

203 The results of the Community Meeting, the Keys to Success, shall be considered when
204 reviewing this proposal.

205

206

I. Stipulations

207

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE June 11, 2015

Page 6 of 6

208 The Planning Commission may craft stipulations on issues including but not limited
209 to: landscaping, utility and mechanical equipment screening and locations, resort
210 operational issues, and special regulatory standards (such as hours of operation,
211 amplified music, etc..) and other land use concerns not otherwise in conflict with this
212 SOD.

213

214 J. Deviations from the SUP Guidelines

215

216 The Planning Commission shall address any improvements/uses that deviate from
217 the SUP Resort Guidelines and the applicant must provide a justification for the
218 deviation from the Guidelines.

219

220 The Planning Commission shall not address development agreement issues such as
221 financing and phasing of construction.

222

223 The Planning Commission shall complete its review and hearing process in 120
224 calendar days from Town Council approval of the SOD (per Section 2-5-2.D.1 of the
225 Town Code). There shall be an option to extend this timeframe, if necessary, with
226 Town Council consent.

227

228 To the extent that the application changes substantially, the revised application shall
229 be brought back to the Town Council and the SOD amended.

230

231

232