



# Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr  
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

## Minutes - Draft

### Planning Commission

---

Tuesday, August 4, 2020

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

---

**IN-PERSON ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC MEETINGS HAS BEEN SUSPENDED UNTIL  
FURTHER NOTICE. WATCH LIVE STREAMED MEETINGS AT:  
<https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>**

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

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

##### **STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

Town Attorney Andrew M. Miller (attended remotely)  
Senior Planner George Burton  
Town Engineer Paul Mood (attended remotely)  
Planning Manager Paul Michaud

#### 2. ROLL CALL

**Present** 6 - Commissioner Jonathan Wainwright  
Commissioner Charles Covington  
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos  
Commissioner Daran Wastchak  
Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell  
Commissioner James Rose  
**Absent** 1 - Commissioner Orme Lewis

#### 3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

#### 4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

- A.** [20-314](#) Continued Discussion of a Major Special Use Permit Amendment  
(SUP-18-05) - 7101 E Lincoln Drive - Smoke Tree Resort

Mr. Gilbert, legal representative for the applicant, noted that his partner Cassie Ayres, Owner of property Taylor Robinson, and Traffic Engineers Dawn Cartier and Sue Thompson were present. He wanted to update the

Commission on all revisions and focus on topics of the Statement of Direction (SOD) that had been preselected for discussion. The changes were detailed in a packet given to the Commission.

- Updated details for the market and coffee shop showing the square footage.
- Provided exhibit showing existing topography and finished floor elevations.
- Added a view of the North elevation as viewed from Lincoln Drive.

He then discussed the specific SOD sections, including parking, landscaping, utilities, lighting, and signage.

Parking:

- The Town and the Smoke Tree's consultants had both mutually concluded that the site plan provided adequate parking on the site.
- Kimley Horn concluded that the peak weekday demand was 187 spaces at 6:00 p.m. in March, and the peak weekend demand was 178 spaces for 8:00 p.m. in March. They believed the demand was addressed with the valet plan.
- He would provide a draft parking management plan. It was currently being updated to include suggestions from parking consultants.
- The parking agreement with adjacent Lincoln Plaza Medical Center was not needed due to the parking being adequate.
- The off-site parking agreement was not necessary, but they did have one.
- They had demonstrated the project would not have a negative impact on traffic safety, parking, and circulation.
- Traffic analysis resulted in one recommendation to change the traffic light timing at Scottsdale Road and Lincoln Drive. The change was recommended regardless of the Smoke Tree Resort being constructed.
- The multiple driveways on Lincoln Drive had been condensed to one main entrance that serviced both the Smoke Tree Resort and Lincoln Medical Center.
- The site provided circulation by cross access with Lincoln Medical Center.
- The main entrance to the Smoke Tree Resort would be through the traffic light on Quail Run Road. The Lincoln Drive access would be primarily a service entrance.

A Commissioner asked if they have a total of 224 spaces available with the medical center agreement.

Mr. Gilbert responded there were 199 spaces with the valet plan.

Ms. Dawn Cartier clarified there would be 224 spaces with the agreement with the medical center for 25 spaces.

Commissioner Rose asked how the hotel meeting banquet visitors in a 4,000 square foot ballroom would result in an estimated parking demand of 48 spaces on Table Six of the Kimley Horn study.

Ms. Cartier noted that parking was not designed for a rush. When they designed parking for a resort, they calculated for the guests already staying at the resort that may be a part of an event.

Commissioner Rose commented that if the resort were at maximum occupancy and there was a 200 guest event, they would need 195 spaces. He noted that the number of employees was understated.

Ms. Cartier noted that the Parking Management Plan used the idea of vouchers for employees to receive rides to the site. It freed approximately 35 spaces.

Commissioner Rose noted that it was a good practice, but he felt that financially that would not be sustainable for the resort owners. He mentioned the valet parking during events could be a challenge based on the configuration.

Ms. Cartier noted that resorts understood the peak of events in advance. In that situation, there would be a need for maximum use of 199 spaces; they would look to park valet off-site first and reserve the spots closer for when the heavier traffic arrived. There would likely be two valet stands during peak hours. She believed the resorts could plan well in advance and be able to manage the guest and employee parking.

Owner Taylor Robinson commented that the distance from the main valet entrance on Quail Run was roughly 500 feet. It would take no longer than a minute for a valet to park a car at the Lincoln Plaza Medical Center and get back to the station. They would leave the entrance and go south through the south end of the resort and then go north to use the shared access driveway to enter the Lincoln Plaza Medical Center parking.

Commissioner Rose felt the plan was ambitious.

Mr. Robinson asked if there was a different plan that Commissioner Rose proposed.

Commissioner Rose noted that the parking needed additional spaces. He disagreed with the consultants' opinion.

Mr. Robinson stated if there were any questions regarding the parking analysis calculations Jeff Weckstein and Sue Thompson were on the line to answer.

Mr. Gilbert noted that as they finalized the parking plan, they could provide more detail and answer any questions. He wanted the Commission to be comfortable with the idea.

Commissioner Covington asked if the parking agreement with Lincoln Plaza Medical Center was in place and if they anticipated any parking on Quail Run Drive.

Mr. Gilbert stated the agreement was enforced. Lincoln Plaza Medical Center had the right to cancel the agreement with 30 days' notice.

Ms. Cartier answered that she did not foresee any parking needed on Quail Run Road. She could not guarantee that people would not park on Quail Run Road.

Commissioner Campbell wondered what the peak use times were for Lincoln Plaza Medical Center.

Ms. Cartier did not anticipate that the peak use times would overlap with the Smoke Tree Resort.

Commissioner Campbell was confused about the Lincoln Drive right-of-way. He wanted clarification from the staff if a third eastbound lane would be necessary, excluding the deceleration lane. He noted a dedication was needed. He asked if that would have an impact on parking and if there was a plan to make Lincoln Drive six lanes wide.

Mr. Mood indicated there were no plans for that at this time. It would be difficult because there was an existing development agreement with Lincoln Plaza Medical Center to the east. They would need to go through an additional acquisition process to get the right-of-way as well.

Mr. Gilbert noted in order for the Town to add a right-of-way, they would need to condemn part of the right-of-way for AJ's Market and other businesses, additional property at Lincoln Plaza Medical Center, property to the west, and then private lots. He noted it was not likely to have three lanes.

Commissioner Campbell stated that three lanes would not be ideal on

Lincoln Drive. The traffic was heavy. His questions was satisfied.

Andrew Miller confirmed that some Council Members did not want to see three lanes in the area.

Chairman Wainwright asked the Commissioners point of view on the dedication of right-of-way.

Commissioner Campbell knew that the engineers on the project would be leaving the meeting soon, and that was why he brought the issue forward.

Commissioner Georgelos referred to the project comparison chart regarding parking. The spaces per key at the resort were on a spectrum from one to over three spaces per key. She asked how the number 1.39 spaces per key was arrived at for the Smoke Tree Resort. The concept of a voucher program did not seem cost-effective. She wanted to know information about those items.

Ms. Cartier noted that when her firm analyze resorts, they evaluate not only the rooms but also the ancillary and outside uses. They began by comparing other resorts parking spaces to key ratios. The Smoke Tree Resort had fewer amenities than other resorts, and it would be penalizing them by disproportionately charging them with parking for ancillary uses. They found that there was more parking per square foot of amenities than any other resort in the Town.

Commissioner Georgelos asked Ms. Cartier to compare and contrast the Smoke Tree Resort to the Hermosa Inn.

Ms. Cartier commented that Hermosa Inn has a small number of rooms. A large portion of visitors came from off-site. The 35 rooms provide 7,000 square feet of ancillary or amenities use. The Smoke Tree had 122 rooms, roughly four times the number of Hermosa Inn, not quite two times the amenity space, creating the difference.

Mr. Gilbert stated the Hermosa Inn was a restaurant that operated as a resort. The Smoke Tree was a resort primarily. He represented the Phoenician Resort with similar issues regarding the parking plan. They were entitled to provide parking for employees off-site and bus their employees to the resort, which the City of Phoenix approved. Commissioner Georgelos asked if that idea had been considered and where the employees would be parked in this instance.

Mr. Gilbert responded that as part of the parking management plan, but he did not know where the parking would be for employees. It could differ

depending on parking availability based on time of year.

Commissioner Georgelos compared the two resorts that the Smoke Tree Resort had more units than the Hermosa Inn. Hermosa Inn had a restaurant approximately 2,600 square feet, and the Smoke Tree Resort had a restaurant about 2,100 square feet. She did not believe the restaurant would be only serve resort guests. Hermosa Inn had 2,000 square feet of retail, and Smoke Tree had 2,500 square feet. She understood that the retail would be for primarily resort guests but figured that others would use these resources. She noted there were three parking spaces per room key at the Hermosa Inn. She preferred to see additional parking at the Smoke Tree Resort regardless of the consultant findings.

Mr. Robinson commented regarding the sentiment to have additional parking, including the 199 spaces plus the 35 spaces by bringing employees in by voucher or other off-site means, and with the Lincoln Plaza Medical Center agreement, that provided a 30 % increase over the available on-site parking should it be needed. The parking consultants and himself could review any assumptions of uses for the retail and fitness portions of the resort. Any contracts for amenities brought to the resort would be made to fit the Smoke Tree requirements.

Commissioner Georgelos noted that the point of the amenities was to encourage business. She felt it would be helpful to review the different parking assumptions and allow the Commission to understand the numbers provided in the parking study.

Ms. Cartier noted the table for Project Comparison of Parking Rates and Amenity Inventory used a number of 170 spaces provided for Smoke Tree with non-valet. With 199 spaces at the Smoke Tree, they are at 1.63 parking spaces ratio. It was just below Mountain Shadows and Doubletree Resorts parking ratio. With the additional 25 parking spaces at Lincoln Plaza Medical Center, the ratio increased to 1.83 spaces that would put the Smoke Tree between Mountain Shadows and Motelucia Resorts parking ratio. When adding a voucher or off-site bussing system for employees, the ratio increased to 2.12, which was in line with the Ritz Carlton parking ratio.

Consultant Sue Thompson stated that they had worked with Ms. Cartier and their team to understand the uses within the facilities.

Commissioner Campbell asked if there was an anticipation of issuing memberships to the fitness center on-site.

Mr. Gilbert stated the fitness area will be limited to only guests of the hotel, and no memberships sold.

Chairman Wainwright noted that when they were comparing the Smoke Tree to other resorts, the Smoke Tree Resort was the only one with the ability for overflow parking on an adjacent property. The peak use times of the Lincoln Plaza Medical Center and the Smoke Tree Resort did not overlap. The Lincoln Plaza Medical Center would probably sell parking to the resort during peak times for employee parking.

Mr. Gilbert believed that was correct. He felt that the assumption of employees parking during peak times in the Lincoln Plaza Medical Center was accurate.

The parking consultant detailed the steps for a shared parking analysis. He referred to Figure 1: Shared Parking Analysis, in the parking study, provided to the Commission. He began with the land use program, which was the primary use of rooms and ancillary uses. He then adjusted the base ratio. Those adjustments included:

- A driving ratio adjustment for visitors using rideshare, taxi, or other means to visit the resort.
- An adjustment to the non-captive ratio. The percent of guests that are on site for a particular use, that are not on-site for additional use. He explained that being an event where a percentage of visitors stayed at the hotel and attended the event.

That would equal the project rate for each land use. The next step would be to evaluate the presence factors. Those factors would be adjusted based on different land uses peak at different times of the year, and also have different variations of activity over the day. This resulted in the recommended supply, which was the output of the shared parking model.

Additionally, he reviewed Table 2: Base Parking Ratios. The ratios were the industry standards found in the Urban Land Institute Model Publication and the Drive Ratio Adjustment for employees used U.S. Census data. Eighty-five percent of employees drove to work alone. They took a ten percent reduction in drive ratio to reflect carpooling activities to be conservative. Hotel guest shared parking had significant research. In shared parking, there was a fifty percent drive ratio. Half arrived via automobile. The Shared Parking guideline was to provide parking for a fifty-nine percent drive ratio on weekday and sixty-nine percent on weekends. It further suggested adding for the adoption of ride-hailing. The data was collected before the advent of Uber or Lyft type services. Paradise Valley did not have many transit options. They decided to classify the use as a business hotel in a suburban environment and used a seventy percent drive rate for the analysis.

Next, he discussed the Hotel Even Space Patrons. The baseline guidance

for resort hotel events was a half driving ratio. With Businesses as hotels, the percentage was higher at a 68 percent drive ratio. In their analysis for the Smoke Tree Resort, they used a 75 percent driving ratio. Retail and Dining customers were all assumed to drive to the location. When non-captive ratios could vary from one property to another, typically a ratio of 20-70 percent had been used to fine-tune parking requirements for mixed-use projects. He referred to Table 4: Non-Captive Ratio Assumptions. He detailed the ratios that varied for the amenities and based on time of day. Presence Factors were adjustments made to account for the parking demand by the hour, day, and month of the year.

He concluded that was the basic model. He referred to Table 5 in the parking study for the calculations. The shared parking model would satisfy the recommended parking supply to fulfill an 85-percentile day. The parking management plan would be to accommodate scenarios of being at max capacity.

Ms. Thompson provided the context regarding the ULI parking model. Walker Consultants and Kimley Horn contributed to the model, but the information came from consultants from across different parts of the industry. A developer looking to see what parking was needed could use this model. It was not only for resorts. Walker Consulting's background was thousands of studies to be sure there wasn't excess parking but still provide adequate parking for visitors.

Commissioner Wastchak commented that the models were fine-tuned. He asked how often they go back and review models to verify them.

Mr. Weckstein replied they do go back and visit properties to see what was happening. He gave examples of going back to resorts and evaluating the parking. Repeat clients state that the studies did work.

Ms. Thompson commented that her background was in operations. Once Mr. Weckstein provided a parking model, she would then base operations of the parking on that. She usually was the one to work with the owner to help them manage the results of the parking study. She did go back and check with the owners once a project was complete.

Commissioner Rose asked Ms. Thompson and Mr. Weckstein what Estimated Parking demand meant referring to Table 5 of the parking study. The study identified that fifty-nine percent of visitors to the resort would drive a car.

Mr. Weckstein commented that it estimated parking need for each individual land use, and then totaled. That was equivalent to an eighty-fifth performing percentile. The ULI publication showed fifty percent, but in their



analysis, they assumed seventy-five percent would drive.

Commissioner Rose noted a leisure guest staying at the resort did not have amenities to keep them on-site. They would probably make adjustments knowing they were going to need to leave the site. He asked if they had underestimated the parking spaces for hotel leisure.

Mr. Weckstein commented there could be a situation of a sell-out of the resort, and it could be all local people not flying into the Town. That could require more parking spaces. The table showed the projected need for hotel guests at the peak of the resort. There was a higher demand later in the evening, but the restaurant and banquet space would be winding down. They did not take the drive ratio for leisure resorts but used the business as a resort model to increase the ratio to a seventy-five percent drive rate.

Mr. Gilbert addressed the topics in the SOD. He stated that the trees had been staggered, changed to live oaks, and showed what was approved for the Lincoln Plaza Medical Center side. He stated this complied with the SOD landscaping guidelines.

Mr. Taylor described the proposed screening of the utility cabinet along Lincoln Drive. He stated that this cabinet did not service the Smoke Tree Resort. It was for regional infrastructure. He did not feel they should be required to move them and it would be costly. He asked for the consideration for the cabinets to stay.

Mr. Gilbert reviewed exterior lighting and signage.

Planning Manager Paul Michaud reviewed items from the staff report and read into the record a new comment from a resident named Mr. Shoen.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the parking lot setbacks, noting the proposed setbacks are not compliant with the Special Use Permit Guideline of 40 feet. He continued that the parking lot screening will include 3' tall walls along the street frontage, with such walls not at the typical 10' setback. Screening along the south and east side includes proposed sour orange hedges and the existing oleanders.

Mr. Michaud continued to discuss the proposed utilities. There was discussion regarding the screening of the existing electric utility cabinet along Lincoln Drive, including the need to provide electric loads to APS to determine relocation.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the landscaping as it related to the Visually Significant Corridors Plan, Special Use Permit Guidelines, and the Town Code. He noted that the landscape setbacks per the guidelines were not

met along the street frontages, that there are two less trees than the guideline along Quail Run Road, and there are no proposed Ironwood trees along the street frontage (only internal to the site).

Mr. Michaud reviewed the proposed exterior lighting. He stated that many 16-foot tall pole lights are not setback the height of the pole, noted that bollard and landscape lighting is shown within the right-of-way not supported by Town staff, raised questions regarding the proposed palm tree lights based on prior Special Use Permit applications, and stated the applicant needed to provide additional summary information on the photometric plan.

The Commissioners discussed the lighting in the rights-of-way and the palm tree ring lights.

Mr. Robinson answered the bollards were proposed outside of the screening wall. The poles were easily removed but felt the combination of well-placed light would benefit the sidewalk.

Chairman Wainwright and Commissioner Campbell were supportive of the lights within the rights-of-way.

Commissioner Campbell stated the palm tree lights are directed downward and located in areas mostly internal to the site. He expressed support for these lights with a stipulation they are not mounted over 16 feet.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the proposed signs. He explained the Zoning Ordinance requirements and Special Use Permit Guidelines. He explained that the resort identification signs exceed the guideline on number of signs and thereby total aggregate sign area. He also stated that the applicant needs to provide details that the sign light source is shielded, its color temperature, and its foot-candle output.

The Planning Commission discussed the resort signs, noting that since the applicant reduced the number of driveways and worked out a shared access driveway with the medical center that the proposed number of signs looks reasonable.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the resort retail signage for accessory use. He stated that Sheets A62 and A63 illustrated signs related to accessory uses and the hotel. If allowed, he suggested that the Planning Commission define the maximum number of signs, maximum mounting height, maximum sign area, and whether illumination is allowable. He added that there are no Town Guidelines for this type of signage.

Commissioner Wastchak wanted to know the locations of the signs for

accessory use. The details were important for staff and the Commission to provide feedback to the applicants. He asked what the staff would need in order not to bring this item back to the Commission.

Mr. Michaud answered that this could be defined by general stipulations, generally located on the building, height to top of the sign, stipulate the maximum number of signs, sign areas if they could be illuminated. For signs visible off the property, there should be stipulations of where they could be located, their size, and if they could be illuminated.

Commissioner Wastchak wanted to be sure that on completion of the resort that there were no surprises. He wanted clear guidelines and clear information on where the signs for accessory uses would be located.

Commissioner Covington wanted clarification that there would be no outward-facing signage for the market or the coffee shop.

Mr. Michaud understood that in a meeting that was stated. He had not heard it personally.

Mr. Robinson commented the signage proposed was comprehensive. They had removed any signage for accessory uses to make them internally facing. They would like outward facing signs but willingly forwent that to make the plan compliant and pleasing.

Commissioner Wastchak asked Mr. Michaud what the Commission needed to provide him with if the ancillary use signs were internally facing.

Mr. Michaud stated that as long as the signs were internal facing and it couldn't be seen from the street, the Town could allow these signs if part of the approval of this application request. He added that these type of signs would still need a building permit.

Commissioner Rose asked if there would be no signs on Buildings G and I.

Mr. Robinson confirmed there would be no outward-facing signs on those buildings. If there was signage on the buildings, it would be restricted so it could not be seen from off-site.

Mr. Michaud stated the next meeting would be on August 18. He detailed the items to be discussed.

Commissioner Campbell wanted to give the applicant credit for the joint entry. He was comfortable that they use signage at that entry also.

Chairman Wainwright agreed with that.

Commissioner Covington asked if the entrance from Lincoln Drive was mainly intended for service.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed, yes.

Commissioner Wastchak referred to the electric cabinet on Lincoln Drive PowerPoint slide. In the legislative update document prepared for the meeting, Mr. Michaud indicated there was sidewalk outside of the dedicated right-of-way that needed an easement. The red area on the picture displayed was a view triangle easement. He asked if that piece of the sidewalk was what he referred to in the legislative update. He asked if staff was recommending there be an easement for that piece of pavement.

Mr. Michaud stated that it was the piece referred to in the document.

Town Engineer Paul Mood commented that any public sidewalk that fell out of the right-of-way would need a sidewalk easement.

Mr. Gilbert was cooperative in providing the easement.

Commissioner Wastchak wanted to know the Town's position on the electrical cabinet located in that area.

Mr. Mood commented that APS representatives indicated there was not sufficient information from the resort if the cabinet could remain. It was old infrastructure, and they were not sure if it could remain or not. The screening requirements were three-foot clear of the cabinet in all directions.

Commissioner Wastchak stated there was not enough room to screen the electrical cabinet.

Mr. Gilbert did not think it needed work but was willing to work with APS and would follow through. He could continue this item to the next meeting.

Mr. Robinson clarified that the red diagram on the photo shown was a roadway easement that the Town had received through a condemnation proceeding. The black triangle was the view triangle. The three-foot clearance for APS was for permanent structures, and one foot for removable panels.

Commissioner Wastchak felt it was important that this item was settled before the Smoke Tree Resort review was complete.

Mr. Robinson noted that part of the information needed by APS was that the lines run for this cabinet were regional and did not serve the resort. The Smoke Tree Resort load data would not apply.

Commissioner Wastchak asked Mr. Mood why APS was telling them that this would impact the project if the load was not coming through that cabinet.

Mr. Mood responded that was the information received from a representative at APS who was familiar with the area.

Commissioner Campbell felt it still needed discussion regardless of if it were a regional or local cabinet as it would affect the design of that corner.

Mr. Mood commented that APS told him if it needed to be replaced by Smoke Tree or APS, it would be replaced with up to two to three cabinets.

Chairman Wainwright wanted to table the discussion for the moment, but felt it needed more information and study in the future. He was sympathetic to the fact that that line was not servicing the Smoke Tree.

Mr. Robinson proposed a solution that they would be happy to stipulate that the cabinet design and screening would need to meet the Visually Significant Corridor plan and Town Ordinance. APS review time was not quick, and to have a settled reviewed drawing would take time. He felt that could be bridged through stipulations. If all concerns of the Commission were met, then the box could remain. If not, then the cabinet would have to be relocated to an appropriate location.

Commissioner Campbell asked if they could use the 56th Street model with the three cabinets and ask the applicant how they would accommodate those three cabinets.

Mr. Robinson was willing to show a drawing to that effect. The cabinet was fed from directly north through Lincoln Drive. The lines exited to the west and went down Lincoln Drive. When a cabinet like that was replaced, the conductors could not be reused and would need to be replaced. There were multiple ways the conductor could be run to affect the cost of replacement drastically.

Commissioner Wainwright did not want to hold up the project hostage to APS's schedule.

Mr. Gilbert stated he might not have the information in the next meeting, but

they would provide it.

Commissioner Georgelos wanted confirmation on what would happen regarding the utility boxes, so there was no miscommunication. She agreed with Commissioner Campbell's suggestion.

Commissioner Covington did not want to hold the applicant up regarding the cabinet, but wanted it to be addressed.

Commissioner Georgelos asked what had historically been done in the rights-of-way regarding the bollards along the sidewalk and lighting on the trees.

Mr. Michaud commented they typically did not see bollards in the right of way or walkways. Occasionally there was landscape lighting in the rights-of-way residentially. Mountain Shadows and the Andaz resort had ring lights for the palm trees. They had been approved, but at those times, there was a desire to limit them and require a maximum height.

Commissioner Georgelos did not feel that the bollards were appropriate in the front areas. It was not generally done in rights-of-way and sidewalks. Instead of lighting the entire area, she asked if they could consider landscape or sidewalk lighting. She did not want the area to be unsafe. She felt that tree lighting should be limited.

Commissioner Georgelos asked the other Commissioners to consider the amount of illumination.

Mr. Michaud commented the applicant submitted photometrics, but they need to provide a summary table for minimum, maximum, and average light levels. That would help the staff determine if it met the guidelines. In his overview, it looked like most of the lighting was compliant.

Chairman Wainwright asked Commissioner Georgelos to articulate her concerns, and then the Commissioners would take a poll of what the Commissioners thought.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if there was concern about the bollards outside of the resorts along the sidewalks, the number of lights and illumination considered, and other aspects as well.

Commissioner Campbell asked the Town Engineer if he had concerns with the lighting regarding the vehicles. He wanted the pathway to be as safe as possible for pedestrians, and that would require lighting. He liked it when desert trees were up-lit. He supported the design.

Mr. Mood responded that there were no safety concerns, but a maintenance issue. Lighting would not impact a driver.

Commissioner Wastchak liked the design. The height of the light-poles could be a concern, but the trees around them would be much taller. He is fine with the bollards facing the property. He wanted the lighting there to be consistent with lighting along Lincoln Drive. Safety was paramount. He was flexible if they could keep consistency.

Chairman Wainwright agreed.

Commissioner Rose wanted the pathway to be on the safe side.

Commissioner Covington asked if this was the only property with lights along the sidewalk on Lincoln Drive.

Mr. Michaud stated there was similar lighting at the Montelucia via an easement on their property. The Visually Significant Corridors plan includes lighting. He stated that the development across the street does not require similar bollard lighting within the rights-of-way.

Commissioner Wastchak asked if the long meandering sidewalk on the north side of Lincoln Drive would have no lighting. He felt that it was interesting that there was no lighting on that path.

Mr. Michaud stated there would only be street lighting at major intersections. Landscaping lighting was not required with that Special Use Permit.

Commissioner Covington stated that the majority of the palm tree lighting would be internal and was open to the lighting. It was a well-documented plan.

Chairman Wainwright was impressed by the lighting, and that was a heavily used sidewalk. He wanted to be sure it was safe.

Mr. Michaud summarized that the next meeting, they would review lot coverage/floor area ratio, the draft ordinance, and revisit items.

Chairman Wainwright was grateful for the presentations. He asked if Commissioners had any thoughts on the right-of-way relating to Lincoln Drive.

Commissioner Wastchak noted his only issue with the dedication of

right-of-way versus easement was already discussed. Once that issue was addressed, he was satisfied with what the Commission had done based on staff's presentation and their thoughtful approach.

Commissioner Georgelos commented that, in general, her concerns with right-of-way dedications were for the Town to acquire the dedications during the Special Use Permit process. She understood that the dedication is based on the staff information provided. If there wasn't a use for another travel lane, that was fine, but didn't want there to be a misstep. If there was never a time that another lane would be added, then the current plan was fine.

Commissioner Campbell stated his concerns were addressed earlier in the meeting, and he was satisfied.

Commissioner Covington deferred to the Town staff and Town Attorney. He felt if they were satisfied, he was also.

Chairman Wainwright commented the third story element was essential to the applicant. The Commissioners were comfortable with what was provided.

## 5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

## 6. ACTION ITEMS

None

## 7. CONSENT AGENDA

### A. [20-315](#) Approval of July 7, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes

**A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Wastchak, to approve the minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Wainwright, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Wastchak, Commissioner Campbell and Commissioner Rose

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Lewis

### B. [20-316](#) Approval of July 21, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes

**A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Wastchak, to approve the minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Wainwright, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Wastchak, Commissioner Campbell and Commissioner Rose



**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Lewis

## **8. STAFF REPORTS**

None

## **9. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS**

Commissioner Campbell commented that in the last two weeks, there had been mass parties on Los Dutchman Street. He noted that State Law regulated that, but as a Planning Commissioner, they should have a stance on the issue. He felt that this was damaging the community.

Commissioner Covington noted that the event was shut down by the Police Department.

Chairman Wastchak noted some residents were gathering as a community to try and impress upon the legislature to make changes. He could put him in touch with them.

Town Attorney Miller stated that the Mayor and Town Council had been active on the issue, but the item was not on the agenda of this meeting.

## **10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Mr. Michaud noted that the next meeting was on August 18th, and the only discussion item was the Smoke Tree Resort.

Chairman Wainwright noted that there was mention of discussion for pad heights.

Mr. Mood would work on a presentation to the Commission in September.

Mr. Michaud asked who would be present.

All the Commission would be present.

Commissioner Wastchak asked about the General Plan.

Mr. Michaud stated there was a new project manager working on the project. They would be issuing an RFP for their consultants to begin working on that documentation. The Council would vote on the contract in October.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Commissioner Georgelos at 8:47 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Wastchak, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 6 - Commissioner Wainwright, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Wastchak, Commissioner Campbell and Commissioner Rose

**Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Lewis

**Paradise Valley Planning Commission**

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Michaud, Secretary