

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.

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