



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes - Draft

Planning Commission

Chairman James Rose
Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner William Nassikas

Tuesday, December 20, 2022

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Rose called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Town Attorney Andrew McGuire
Planning Manager Paul Michaud
Senior Planner George Burton (attended remotely)
Planner Brandon McMahon

2. ROLL CALL

**Commission Members Georgelos and Campbell attended remotely, with
Commission Member Georgelos joining the meeting at 6:13 p.m.**

Present 6 - Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner James Rose

Absent 1 - Commissioner William Nassikas

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

4. ACTION ITEMS

- A.** [22-369](#) Consideration of a Preliminary Plat (PP-22-01) Coconino 17 - Twelve Lot Subdivision with two Public Roads: 8097-8181 N Coconino Road (APN: 168-79-001A, 001B, 004A & 004B)

Commissioner Locke disclosed that she had to recuse herself and refrain from discussion because she had a conflict of interest on this item.

Mr. McMahon provided an overview of the item, covering the background, scope of the request, actions, and next steps. The applicant is seeking to develop a twelve-lot subdivision, along with two 50-foot-wide public cul-de-sac roads to access the twelve lots. The homes will comply with all R-43 requirements. The preliminary plat is compliant with the Town's development standards. Drainage easements will be used to modify and maintain existing washes on site, as shown on the preliminary plat. The proposed lots will meet all standards related to fire protection. The project meets and exceeds all landscape code requirements. The proposed roadway improvements are compliant with the Town's requirements. The applicant provided public notice to the surrounding property owners within the 1,500-foot radius policy. He continued that staff received one comment on this proposed subdivision regarding drainage and the timing of the hearing during the holiday season. With the approval of the preliminary plat, the final plat will need to be submitted to the Town along with all required submittal items. Once deemed complete, the final plat will be heard by Town Council at a future study session and acted upon at a Town Council meeting. Mr. McMahon concluded that staff recommends approval of the application, subject to four stipulations provided in the agenda packet.

Commissioner Covington asked about the wash modification requirements and about a third-party study that was done.

Mr. McMahon reviewed the buildable area threshold that applied to Lots 8, 9, and 11. He stated that a resident requested the third-party study, and it was paid by the Town.

Commissioner Liepmann asked that the study be provided to the Commission.

Commissioner Campbell asked about the current zoning on the parcels. He suggested stipulating that walls should have a similar design along Coconino Road.

Mr. McMahon replied that parcels are zoned R-43 and that each subdivision will have its own wall design.

Buzz Silverman, the applicant, stated that it's a great idea to have a consistent design along Coconino Road. He committed to having a consistent wall on the four lots facing Coconino Road.

Commissioner Liepmann supported Commissioner Campbell's suggestion to stipulate a consistent wall design.

Commissioner Campbell proposed an additional stipulation to commit future owners to a similar landscape palette. He appreciated the applicant's willingness to accept the proposed stipulations.

Responding to a question on landscape area, Mr. Michaud noted that with a 20-foot wall setback, there would be around 30 feet of landscaping between the back of curb and wall along Coconino Road as these are the designated street side yards.

Commissioner Liepmann asked if any of the houses were expected to front onto Coconino Road.

Mr. Silverman replied that he would be happy to provide that information to the Commission once he gets further into architectural aesthetics.

Commissioner Campbell suggested adding a stipulation requiring adding a one-foot non-vehicular easement along Coconino Road.

Commissioner Liepmann asked for clarification regarding the purpose of such a stipulation.

Mr. Michaud clarified that a one-foot easement next to the property line would prohibit an accessway such as a driveway.

Chairman Rose asked about peak traffic hours.

Mr. Michaud clarified that there will be 11 morning and 14 afternoon peak hour trips and that they are per lot with the slide showing 143 total average daily trips.

Commissioner Georgelos asked how the drainage easements would be treated.

Mr. McMahon replied that the washes would have to enter and exit the site as they always have historically. In addition, the proposed drainage easements will be moved further to the east through the box culvert underneath the lower cul-de-sac road and then further to the north. This will help mitigate on-site flows and retention.

Eric Kaitz, a resident, asked if the street improvements on Coconino. His driveway goes right up the street, and he has landscaping that would also be affected by street improvements.

Mr. McMahon replied that the applicant is responsible for the eastern frontage of Coconino Road. The changes wouldn't affect the whole of Coconino Road.

Sharon Warren, a resident, stated that she lives on the north side of the property. She believed that her property was the most affected by this project because it overlooks it directly. She was concerned that the Town could take the road in front of the development and add an easement. She wanted the road to stay the same as approved.

Mr. McMahon clarified that the improvements would only be on the applicant's frontage. The Town will not require any adjacent properties to have the same kind of improvements as part of this plat process.

Ken Phelps, a resident, stated that he has lived in the neighborhood for 28 years. He was concerned with the wash because he wasn't convinced that the flow could be controlled when adding 12 properties. There have been big issues in the past. He was wondering how many developers are building the houses.

Mr. Silverman replied that they were currently looking at one builder.

Judy Hoechner, a resident, stated that she opposed the plan to build 12 houses on the undeveloped plot of land. When she purchased her house five years ago, she was assured that there was a five-acre minimum covenant. She was disturbed by this proposal because it would change the neighborhood and add noise and air pollution. She urged the Town to seriously consider the detrimental impact on the overall environment before approving this high-density housing.

Commissioner Liepmann asked Ms. Hoechner about the source of information regarding the five-acre minimum covenant.

Ms. Hoechner replied that she had heard it many times from neighbors and developers.

Mr. McMahon stated that recorded documents from circa 1948 required a five-acre minimum. The applicant has provided staff with some legal backing saying that those instruments had a sunset clause and are all voided. He also reminded the Planning Commission that the Town doesn't enforce deed restrictions.

Scott Schultze, a resident, stated that he lives on the northeast border of the development. He was curious if the developer could speak to the longevity of construction. He works from home and will see and hear the construction.

Mr. Silverman replied that the construction could take 3-5 years.

Commissioner Covington asked if any documents have been provided to show where the water entering the site at the southern edge is coming from.

Mr. McMahon replied that the water was coming from Mummy Mountain and the lots west/southwest of this site.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if any topographical views exist in terms of the flatness of the terrain.

Mr. McMahon replied that the applicant provided a plat map graphic with the topographic detail which is in the packet.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that she was concerned about subdividing the parcel in such a way that washes are being moved around and potential issues are being created.

Mr. McMahon replied that this is a preliminary drainage report and that the applicant will have to submit a final drainage report. Additionally, each building permit for each lot that comes in for approval will have to have its own grading and drainage plan and retention basins.

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Liepmann, to approve the preliminary plat with three additional stipulations related to Lots 1, 6, 7, and 12 adjoining Coconino Road (Stipulation 1.h on requiring a one-foot non-vehicular access easement, Stipulation 3.c requiring uniform design, color, and material for site walls, and Stipulation 3.d maintaining a similar plant palette), plus the stipulations in the action report. The stipulations are as follows:

1. The Final Plat and related improvements for “Coconino 17” located at 8097-8181 N Coconino Road (the “Property”) shall be in substantial compliance with the submitted plans and documents:

- a. The Narrative prepared by Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc
- b. The “Coconino 17” Preliminary Plat, Sheets 1 - 2, prepared Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc with revised dated October 24, 2022
- c. The “Coconino 17 Paving Plan”, Sheets PV-1 – PV-3, prepared by Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc yet to be submitted with Final Plat
- d. The “Coconino 17 Water Plan”, Sheets W-1 – W-2, prepared by Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc yet to be submitted with Final Plat
- e. The “Coconino 17 Sewer Plan”, Sheets SS-1 – SS-2, prepared by Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc yet to be submitted with Final Plat
- f. The Preliminary Drainage Report, prepared by Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc dated October 24, 2022
- g. The “Landscape Plan”, prepared by Coe & Van Loo Consultants, Inc, with revised date of October 27, 2022
- h. 1-foot non-vehicular access easement along Coconino Road frontage to be shown on the plat, per Planning Commission 12-20-22 created stipulation.

2. Prior to the recordation of “Coconino 17,” the following items shall be completed:

- a. The owner(s) of the Property, or successors, shall provide the Town, with a Drainage Easement and Maintenance Agreement for Lot 4, Lot 7, Lot 8, Lot 9, Lot 10, Lot 11, and Lot 12. These forms shall be submitted and approved by the Town and recorded with the Maricopa County Recorder’s Office.
- b. The owner(s) of the Property, or successors, shall submit the required final improvement plans for Town Engineer approval and provide a cost estimate for civil improvements (water, sewer, paving, storm drainage, landscaping etc.) to determine the financial assurance requirements.
- c. Provide the required forms of assurances necessary for the Town to be in a guaranteed position to complete the construction and related public site improvements as referenced in the Coconino 17 Paving, Water, Sewer and Landscape Plans.
- d. Within 60 days of Town Council approval of the final plat, the applicant shall submit, both in mylar and electronic version (PDF format), the Final Plat for the Town’s permanent record.

3. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for any home on Lots 1-12 of “Coconino 17,” the following items must be completed:

- a. The owner(s) of the Property shall complete the improvements located within the public rights-of-way (Coconino Road, Ironwood Drive and Maverick Road) .
- b. The installation of the water and sewer infrastructure is complete, including the installation of new fire hydrants and inspection by the Town.
- c. Individual lot site walls to be uniform in design, color and material for lots fronting Coconino Road, specifically Lots 1, 6, 7 & 12 (per Planning Commission 12-20-22 created stipulation).

d. Individual lots fronting Coconino Road, specifically Lots 1, 6, 7 & 12, to maintain the similar plant palette as the Landscape Plan.

4. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy in "Coconino 17" subdivision, the following items must be completed:

- a. The property owner(s) or designee(s) shall demonstrate that the fire sprinkler system is in compliance with the National Fire Protection Association standard 13D or the current equivalent code requirement.
- b. The property owner(s) or designee(s) shall complete the landscape improvements, per the Landscape Plan.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann and Commissioner Rose

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Nassikas

Recused: 1 - Commissioner Locke

5. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

- A. [22-370](#) Andaz Resort Intermediate Special Use Permit Amendment (SUP) - 6160 N Scottsdale Rd and Rezoning of 6041 N Quail Run Rd for R-43 to SUP Resort

Mr. Burton provided an overview of the item, covering the background, scope of the request, actions, and next steps. He noted that this is the third time that the Commission is looking at this item. He provided a summary of what happened at the last Commission meeting. The Commission requested that the applicant provide a detailed landscape plan along Quail Run Road. Additionally, the Commission requested a stipulation prohibiting outdoor amplified music for the guest units and the service building between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The applicant provided a detailed landscape plan and an addendum to the noise study. The addendum identified that the modeling used a worst-case scenario, and the noise levels of the new improvements will be consistent with the existing noise environment at 42-47 decibels. Staff drafted two ordinances (2023-01 and 2023-02) for the Commission to review. Mr. Burton provided a summary of each of the 21 proposed stipulations and that this item will be brought back before the Commission for recommendation on January 3, 2023.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that Quail Run Road is a very narrow road and barely fits one car. She asked about the reason that this road was not being developed.

Mr. Burton replied that many neighbors supported keeping the road unchanged and maintaining the landscaping to match what was done north of the subject site.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the road in its current state is dangerous. It's functional only because the area on the east side is not developed, and drivers can pull in there to make place for an oncoming car. He can't support an

application that has a dangerous road. Instead, he recommended following what the engineer recommended in the initial report.

Mr. Burton discussed the immediate amendment and how it's limited to geographical location.

Chairman Rose noted that he received another email from Angela Cole. Ms. Cole had concerns about widening the road and strongly opposed it.

Responding to connecting Quail Run Road through and the proposed subdivision at 6310 N Quail Run Road, Mr. Michaud noted that the preliminary plans only show a pedestrian connection that exists today via the 25-foot right-of-way adjoining the Andaz Resort. The proposed plat will access their site from Lincoln Drive.

Commissioner Georgelos asked for clarification regarding emergency and larger vehicles.

Mr. Michaud clarified that the proposed residential development includes a hammerhead turnaround at the north end of Quail Run Road.

Commissioner Georgelos reiterated that Quail Run Road is too narrow for large vehicles.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the only reason why large vehicles are going down that road is that they are using the vacant land to turn around.

Commissioner Liepmann noted that she received a letter from Collen Steinberg, who was concerned about the easement and water.

Mr. McMahon stated that he could address this question at the next meeting.

Gary Stoutgaard, the applicant, commented on the question and clarified that he had several conversations with residents. They are concerned that the landscape material was planted in the northern part and didn't survive. He had a conversation with a local company that will plant the right materials and provide water so the existing landscape is sustainable.

Commissioner Locke discussed noise. She provided an example of two guest units, one with a large party and the other with two people in a quieter setting. She was wondering if there is a way to require minimum nights on the guest units located along Quail Run Road.

Mr. Burton noted that it could be required, but it would be difficult to enforce.

Mr. Stoutgaard stated that he has tried to be as sensitive as possible by following stipulations regarding the height of walls and buildings. However, if units are smaller, people are more likely to meet outside rather than inside. His company's plan is intended to minimize the impact on the property as much as possible. They have taken into account concerns about noise and have tried to minimize the impact on the property. They have also chosen to control access

to the road around the property as a way to control activity on the property.

Commissioner Locke and Mr. Stoutgaard discussed the security and parking regulations at the resort. The expectation is that only registered guests should be at the resort, and if guests are causing problems, they will be asked to leave. There are two parking spaces per unit, and overnight occupancy is limited. Mr. Stoutgaard wanted to control the experience, so the guests were happy with their stay.

Jeremy Chandler, resident, stated that he lives on McDonald Drive south of the resort. He expressed his frustration with the continued noise. The screaming and shouting go on every weekend. He added the crowd noise is an issue and his biggest concern since the code addresses amplified noise and not people talking.

Commissioner Liepmann stated that she had the same experience with the noise. The resort employees try to tell the customers to reduce the noise, but it only quiets down for about 15 minutes and then goes back up. She understands that from the business perspective, the primary goal is to ensure that the guests have a good time and want to return in the future. However, the business should consider neighbors living in the area.

Lee Storey, resident, thanked Mr. Stoutgaard for raising the perimeter wall to 8 feet tall. She lived in her home adjoining the resort for 33 years. She saw different plans on this site. She feels it can work. Noise is an issue with anything. She added that the resort staff will go out and noise many times quiets down but starts back up. She feels the neighbors end up enforcing the noise and not the resort.

Mr. Stoutgaard stated that the resort has existed for many years and that he's trying to be as sensitive as possible to the neighbors. He's trying to do something that works for everybody.

Commissioner Liepmann stated that she was concerned that the drainage plan could affect the southern property.

Mr. Stoutgaard noted that the southern property wouldn't be affected because the plan calls for underground storage tanks.

Mr. Burton stated that this item would be brought back before the Commission on January 3, 2023.

No Reportable Action

B. [22-347](#)

**Discussion of Scottsdale Plaza Intermediate Special Use Permit
7200 N Scottsdale Road (SUP-22-02)**

Mr. Michaud provided an overview of the item, covering the scope of the request, Statement of Direction, uses, and areas of the proposal not meeting the Special Use Permit (SUP) Guidelines.

Commissioner Campbell asked for a definition of "big sister" related to the guest room building.

Mr. Michaud replied that this is a temporary place-holder term, not an industry term.

Commissioner Campbell asked about the height of the enclosed pool viewing deck.

Mr. Michaud replied that the building has two stories and it's 30 feet tall. The viewing deck is about 15 feet tall.

Commissioner Liepmann asked if there is an additional event space south of the meeting center.

Mr. Michaud stated that the location of the new event lawn will be south of the main lodge in the area of the current parking lot which is north of the main Scottsdale Road access

Commissioner Georgelos inquired about the distance of the nearest residences.

Mr. Michaud replied that the closest house to the area of improvements is along the north side of Hummingbird Lane and approximately 250 feet away.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about limits on amplified music from the proposed viewing deck and the opening of the sliding doors.

Mr. Michaud replied that staff is drafting stipulations, including a limitation on these areas, and the event space will primarily be used for receptions.

Commissioner Campbell suggested not having operable windows on the north façade of the viewing deck to address any potential concerns with nearby residences.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the proposed improvements starting in the southeast quadrant at Scottsdale Road and Indian Bend Road which will see the most changes to the northwest quadrant having no changes expect for painting the exterior of the existing buildings and renovating the interiors of these buildings.

Commissioner Covington asked if the resort had its own laundry on site.

Mr. Michaud replied that he believed it did, and will follow up.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the proposed density, lot coverage, and floor area ratio. The resort meets the guidelines for lot coverage and total area impervious but may be slightly over the guideline for lot coverage at 25.7%.

Commissioner Locke asked if the staff is not concerned about the additional units because they are still below 60% of all impervious area.

Mr. Michaud replied that the size and location of the site, as well as the fact that most of the buildings are single story with some two-story structures, contribute to the ability of the site to handle the proposed density.

Commissioner Campbell asked if it would be possible to get similar data for other resorts in the Town.

Mr. Michaud replied that he has a graph and table with data for other resorts he will provide at the next meeting but notes that the numbers are estimates and should be taken with caution, but will show trends.

Mr. Michaud and the Commissioners discussed the site's height, setback, and orientation of new structures. They also talked about the visibility of the buildings, the impact of the two tallest buildings on the site, and the privacy and noise levels for adjacent residents. The existing perimeter setbacks for the site were discussed, as well as the service structures and accessory structures, including three restaurants. Furthermore, Mr. Michaud discussed the lighting and the existing non-compliant light fixtures.

Mr. Michaud further described the underground parking garage, retention basins, and underground basins that will be added to ensure compliance with the Town's standards. He also mentioned that the access points will remain the same and that the interior drive will still have a loop. However, the parking will be reduced from 738 to 547 spaces, with a guideline of 1.2 spaces per unit (which the proposal meets at 1.2 spaces per unit).

Commissioner Locke expressed concern about the decrease in parking.

Mr. Michaud clarified that the restaurant parking would be reserved for valet only and not open to the public. He discussed the square footage of the meeting space, which is currently 41,346 and will be reduced to 34,005 after the proposed changes.

Commissioner Covington asked about the percentage of visitors expected to be from the resort.

Mr. Michaud stated that he did not have that information at this time.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the landscaping.

Mr. Michaud stated that the proposed landscaping should be able to soften the restaurants.

Commissioner Campbell raised concerns about the guideline of 1.2 parking spaces per unit being oversimplified and wanted to make sure that the 547 parking spaces would be sufficient for all the different uses of the resort. He inquired about the restaurants and if they will mostly be open for lunch and dinner, and the existing restaurant, CJ's, will remain but with a different concept.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that she was concerned about the parking situation at the location due to the addition of new uses such as restaurants, a spa, and other changes. She believed that the underground parking may not compensate for the increased demand and did not want there to be a parking problem in the future.

Mr. Michaud stated that parking will be discussed by the Commission at a later time.

No Reportable Action

C. [22-374](#)

Verizon Wireless Conditional Use Permit (CUP) at Camelback Inn Resort & Spa - 5402 E Lincoln Drive

Mr. Burton provided an overview of the item, covering the background, scope, and next steps. He stated that the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum setback of 200 feet from the nearest dwelling unit, but two of the three sectors will encroach on this limit. However, the Ordinance allows the Commission to modify requirements. He continued that the staff supports the encroachments because they do not increase the height of the building, blend in with the design, and comply with all other requirements. The Commission had previously approved a similar request for T-Mobile in the same area on this ballroom building. The proposed antennas and radio heads will be concealed behind existing parapets or new screens that match the existing building and will not cause any negative impacts such as odor, noise, vibration, smoke, or heat. The applicant has provided a report demonstrating compliance with federal requirements. The Commission will review and consider the proposal at its meeting on January 17, 2023.

Commissioner Covington asked for clarification on the difference between an antenna and radio head.

Graham Chapman, a site acquisition specialist with Verizon, explained that an antenna distributes the wireless signal, and a radio head helps transfer it.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the purpose of the facility.

Mr. Chapman explained that it was to increase the capacity in the area.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the potential for interference with other frequencies.

Mr. Chapman explained that they follow federal guidelines to prevent interference.

Commissioner Covington asked about the distance between the antennas, and Commissioner Liepmann asked about the locations of the existing antennas.

Mr. Burton reviewed these on the site plan. The Verizon antennas are in three different areas of the building, while T-Mobile antennas are located near each of the Verizon antennas. He indicated that the Verizon antennas are in the darker

areas on the map, while the T-Mobile antennas are in the lighter areas.

Mr. Covington asked if the T-Mobile antenna was already in place.

Mr. Burton replied that the T-Mobile antenna was approved about 2014. He further discussed the Radio Frequency (RF) study that was included in the packet. The ultimate conclusion of the RF study was that everything is compliant with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) standards and that Verizon will have to put up signage and barriers on the roof for the occupational level.

Commissioner Campbell noted that he can attest to the lack of quality cell phone coverage in the area and is happy to see Verizon adding more infrastructure to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about the setbacks for the Verizon antenna and why they are not compliant.

Mr. Burton explained that they are trying to use the existing building and not modify it or increase its height to improve coverage. In addition, the RF report showed that the antenna is compliant with federal standards.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the requirements for the T-Mobile antenna and how it was approved.

Mr. Burton explained that the code allows for deviation and that the T-Mobile antenna was approved because it demonstrated that the setback did not affect compliance with federal standards.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he was on the Commission when the T-Mobile antenna was approved. He explained that they considered the adjacent Colonia Miramonte subdivision to be part of the greater Special Use Permit for Camelback Inn.

Mr. Burton noted that this item.

No Reportable Action

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

7. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. [22-375](#) Approval of the December 6, 2022 Planning Commission Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Liepmann, seconded by Commissioner Covington, to approve the minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke and Commissioner Rose

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Nassikas

8. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Michaud thanked the Planning Commission for all their work in 2022.

9. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

None

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Michaud reviewed the items for the January 3rd meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Covington at 9:22 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Locke, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke and Commissioner Rose

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Nassikas

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Paul Michaud, Secretary