



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, August 31, 2021

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

**Special Meeting. 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 Rose called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Town Attorney Andrew McGuire
Community Development Director Lisa Collins
Senior Planner George Burton
Special Projects Planner Loras Rauch
Town Engineer Paul Mood

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioner Georgelos entered the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Present 7 - Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner William Nassikas
Commissioner James Rose

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

- A. [21-284](#) Discussion on the 2022 General Plan Land Use Map, Circulation Map and Classification Standards, Open Space Map, and review of the public comments received by the Town during the summer Work Sessions and Special Work Sessions of the Planning Commission.

Loras Rauch, Special Projects Planner, provided a brief overview of the project timeline. She indicated the project is currently in the enrich stage which included reviewing draft elements of the plan with the Commission and Council. She noted that the land use plan was essentially the same. She indicated some of the changes included the removal of the mixed land use categories of low density residential or resort country club and private open space or resort country club that were associated with development areas. She stated that they also included any Council approved updates that had happened since the 2012 General Plan. She shared those open spaces had also been removed from the land use map and put on their own new map for the 2022 General Plan.

Commissioner Locke inquired if staff considered identifying areas that were affected by flood plains as a reference for future development.

Ms. Rauch replied that she believed those maps were included in the community assessment report and noted an appendix to the General Plan could be discussed. She added that these maps are also available on the flood plain viewer website with Maricopa County.

Commissioner Locke asked if there was a reference to the storm water management plan in the General Plan.

Ms. Rauch indicated it was in the environmental section.

Ms. Rauch provided an overview of the open space map. She noted this was a new map that better defines the different types and locations of the existing open space. She noted as in the 2012 General Plan that both public and private rights-of-way are considered open space.

Commissioner Locke recommended it be made clearer on the open space map that roadways are considered public open space.

Ms. Rauch presented the roadway classifications map and pointed out changes including the change in designation of Lincoln Drive and Tatum Boulevard as visually significant corridors. She noted the dashed major arterial lines indicating a non-Paradise Valley street classification were removed since these are still major arterials and that local streets have been drawn with a lighter weight compared to the 2012 General Plan roadway classification map.

Commissioner Nassikas proposed the idea of having the names of certain streets imposed on the map if it did not make the maps too busy.

Ms. Rauch replied she will speak with the consultant about adding street names to the map.

Ms. Rauch reviewed the public comments regarding the General Plan. She noted that she received 11 comments between June 7, 2021, and August 16, 2021. She indicated that most comments discussed the removal of the Development Area designation, open space, and public transit. She pointed out that some of the comments were premature, but identified some unintended consequences and shortcomings. She noted public comments are encouraged during the Council review in September and October as well as at upcoming community workshop.

Ms. Rauch provided an overview of the next steps including a Commission work session on September 7th, in addition to other work sessions for the Commission and Council throughout September and October. She pointed out there is a required 60-day public comment review period, tentatively set for November 1st to December 31st and a second community workshop that will be held during the first part of November.

Chairman Rose called for any public comments. No comments were made.

No Reportable Action

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

6. ACTION ITEMS

None

7. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. [21-269](#) Approval of the August 3, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Covington, to The motion carried by the following vote:

- Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

8. STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Collins announced that the Planning Commission training is scheduled for September 10th at 9:00 a.m. and members of the Commission could reach out to her if they had any questions regarding the orientation.

9. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

Commissioner Campbell reminded everyone of the Board of Adjustment meeting taking place tomorrow where they will discuss disregarding code requirements to screen solar panels on a hillside property.

Lisa Collins, Community Development Director, noted that if enough members of the Commission were planning to attend that it is necessary to notify the public 24 hours in advance to avoid violating any open meeting laws. She noted

that some could submit comments before hand to express their views, but avoid a quorum being present.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

George Burton, Senior Planner, stated their agenda for the September 7, 2021, meeting would include the General Plan.

Ms. Collins pointed out the agenda for the following meeting on September 21, 2021, would include discussion on walls and fences.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Covington at 6:58 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Liepmann, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Paul Michaud, Secretary



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, August 17, 2021

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Town Attorney Andrew McGuire
Community Development Director Lisa Collins
Planning Manager Paul Michaud
Special Projects Planner Loras Rauch

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioner Georgelos entered the meeting at 6:14 p.m.
Commissioner Covington entered the meeting around 8:00 p.m.

Present 7 - Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner William Nassikas
Commissioner James Rose

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

- A.** [21-267](#) Consideration of Proposed Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations for Walls, View Fences and Combination View Fences
- Lisa Collins, Community Development Director, stated the Planning Commission can discuss the item during the study session and the action

portion would be continued to the second meeting in September to provide ample time for the Commission to review and to allow for residents to voice their opinions. She reviewed the proposed text amendment, as well as the fence hedge maintenance agreements.

Commissioner Campbell stated he believed most of the Commissioners did not want any changes on the collector streets.

Commissioner Locke and Commissioner Covington agreed with Commissioner Campbell.

Ms. Collins stated she would make that revision. She displayed the current code requirements of the fence hedge maintenance agreements and discussed the current language. She added the actual ordinance was included in the meeting packet. She mentioned she would be making the adjustments in the code language moving forward with the proposed changes.

Commissioner Campbell suggested a compliance plan be implemented as part of the code.

Ms. Collins understood the request and agreed to take the suggestion to the Town Council.

Commissioner Georgelos questioned the enforcement capabilities.

Ms. Collins responded the challenge with landscape was that it is ever changing. She also mentioned the limited staff numbers, with only one code enforcement officer.

Commissioner Covington questioned if verbiage could be added to the code to address the enforcement issues.

Ms. Collins responded she would provide all the input to the Town Council.

Commissioner Campbell suggested adding a phrase such as, "The agreement is to have a plan, as an exhibit, illustrating compliance with the code."

Ms. Collins questioned if this would require a new review and agreement each time the homeowner would like to make changes.

Commissioner Campbell believed the Town should have an exhibit which identified the landscape within the hedge area.

Commissioner Liepmann requested to view the actual agreement.

Commissioner Georgelos reiterated her concern that the lack of enforcement would make any agreement irrelevant.

Ms. Collins read the agreement in its entirety.

Commissioner Liepmann did not see a need to say more in the agreement other than the homeowner would comply with all zoning codes. She believed the issue being raised was more about limited government and enforcement. She did not agree that Commissioner Campbell's suggestion would solve the issue they seemed to be discussing.

Discussion occurred regarding the ability to remedy contract and code violations.

Ms. Collins reiterated she would be forwarding the recommendations to the Town Council. She added they would not see the document again until the second meeting in September, where they would be making a formal recommendation. She clarified she would use the table to revise the code.

Chairman Rose mentioned the homeowner may be confused about what the code states. He questioned if the proposed code amendment will help clear up some of the confusion.

Ms. Collins believed that any change is an improvement, specifically altering the formatting to improve understandability.

Chairman Rose stated the Hillside Building Committee made codes very clear to builders and contractors. He believed the proposed amendments will assist with clarity.

Ms. Collins added she was available for additional comments, suggestions, or questions as they continue to work through the process.

No Reportable Action

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. [21-268](#) Continue to September 21 ,2021 Consideration of Proposed Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations for Walls, View Fences and Combination View Fences

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Nassikas, to continue Item 21-268, consideration of proposed Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations for walls, view fences, and combination view fences to the regular Planning Commission hearing on September 21, 2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

6. STUDY SESSION ITEMS (Continued)

- A. [21-266](#) Discussion on the 2022 General Plan Goals and Policies within the Open Space and Recreation, Environmental Planning and Water Resources, Sustainability, and Public Facilities/Services and Cost of Development Elements.

Matthew Klyszeiko with Michael Baker presented the four elements for discussion this evening. He began with the draft Open Space and Recreation Element covering the four types of open space. He provided examples for each type. He asked if there were any questions regarding this element.

Commissioner Nassikas requested clarification regarding the open area at the southeast corner of Lincoln Drive and 56th Street.

It was clarified that the property in question is private open space, which was also stated in the Special Use Permit zoning for the Mountain Shadows resort.

Mr. Klyszeiko questioned if the Commission would prefer to review the simplified option or the detailed track changes.

Commissioner Georgelos and Commissioner Liepmann requested utilizing the detailed track changes to review the document.

Mr. Klyszeiko stated many of the edits appeared to be more robust due to some sections being moved in their entirety within the document. He mentioned there were many redundancies and inconsistent terminologies, which had been revised. He reviewed changes within the first goal and requested comments or questions.

Commissioner Locke voiced concern regarding Policies 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3 on pursuing the gifts of land as it related to the cost of maintenance and safety with additional open space. She suggested the addition of a verbiage to acknowledge that concern.

Mr. Klyszeiko agreed with Commissioner Locke and believed it was a worth while consideration.

Commissioner Georgelos requested the definition of "built environment."

Mr. Klyszeiko replied it was another way to say "urban environment." He questioned if the Commission would agree with changing the name of the section to leave out the term "recreation." It was decided to remove "recreation" from the section heading.

Mr. Klyszeiko moved on to the Environmental Planning and Water Resources Element. He reviewed the revisions made within the section.

Commissioner Georgelos and Commissioner Locke agreed with the language

revisions that had been made.

Mr. Klyszeiko discussed the term “monitor” in Goal 1 and explained it could be considered an outcome action item. He believed the term “encourage” was more appropriate from a policy standpoint. He discussed the tree canopy with the Town being part of the Tree City, USA program and mentioned they had made some minor revisions within the goal. He mentioned they had not made any changes to the Visual Resource Preservation section. He added they were attempting to avoid unnecessary redundancies within the plan. He asked if there were any questions or comments.

There were no comments to the policies on Goal 2, Tree Canopy, or Goal 3, Visual Resource Preservation.

Chairman Rose on the policies of Goal 4, Air and Noise Quality, questioned if it was possible to request Town trash collection vendors use low emission vehicles.

Mr. Klyszeiko responded it is a challenge to identify each vendor, but the text can be changed to say encourage.

Mr. Klyszeiko brought up on Policy 4.6 that in the recent General Plan survey support of EV or autonomous use received the lowest ratings. He added he was unsure whether this was low because of autonomous vehicles or truly both those and electric vehicles.

Commissioner Georgelos suggested removing the verbiage regarding fast tracking the electric charging stations.

Mr. Klyszeiko replied they could use the term encourage, rather than to fast track.

Chairman Rose added he understood the fast-track verbiage pertained to the permitting and review process.

Mr. Klyszeiko agreed with Chairman Rose.

Commissioner Campbell voiced concern that the verbiage seemed to be rather specific, considering the document was intended to be visionary.

Chairman Rose and Commissioner Georgelos agreed with Commissioner Campbell.

Mr. Klyszeiko stated he would remove that verbiage and revise the section to be less specific.

There were no comments on Goal 5, Water Supply.

Mr. Klyszeiko reviewed the policies in Goal 6, Water Quality.

Commissioner Campbell questioned if the term in Policy 6.2 should be “sewer providers” instead of “water providers.”

Mr. Klyszeiko responded yes.

Mr. Klyszeiko moved on to the Sustainability Element. He stated this section is not required by State Statute, noting there have been several edits to this Element due to overlap within the section and other sections, which the consultant team removed or amended to avoid redundancy and increase clarification and consistency.

Discussion occurred regarding the section headings, and it was decided they would remain unchanged.

Commissioner Locke stated she was in favor of the alternative language change proposed in Policy 2.5.

Commissioner Campbell provided additional feedback and suggestions.

Mr. Klyszeiko summarized the guidance for this Element as encouragement for special use permits, government buildings being maintained, not specifying a level, and incorporating some of the additional language currently within the section. He then briefly reviewed the proposed edits in the greenhouse gasses and water conservation goals.

Commissioner Locke suggested the addition of bioswales and bioretention.

Mr. Klyszeiko then moved onto the Public Facilities Element goals and policies. He stated he had left the Public Facilities section to the end, due to it not having many edits. He mentioned safety and law enforcement had been the topic of many public comments and most edits within that section were clarification edits.

Commissioner Campbell questioned if they should add categories for internet or cell phone.

Mr. Klyszeiko replied he believed they had addressed that within other policies, but stated he would make a note and make sure it was sufficiently addressed. He thanked the Commissioners for their input.

Ms. Rauch reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule. She suggested additional special work sessions on August 31, 2021 and September 14, 2021. She added that these special meetings will give the Town Council September and October to review the draft, which would give the ability to begin the 60-day review by November 1, 2021.

Commissioner Nassikas, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Georgelos, and Chairman Rose all stated they would be available for the special meeting on August 31, 2021.

Mr. Klyszeiko clarified the Planning Commission will review the Land Use Plan and the Circulation Plan on August 31, 2021. Then, on September 7, 2021, they would review the action items. During the 60-day review will be a community workshop for residents to comment on the draft plan. Following the 60-day review, the consultant team will make final edits prior to the draft plan moving through the public hearing process. He mentioned that some of the dates may be refined, based upon the preference of the Council and Commission.

No Reportable Action

7. ACTION ITEMS

None

8. CONSENT AGENDA

None

9. STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Collins stated they had scheduled the Planning Commission, Hillside Building Committee and Board of Adjustment orientation on September 10, 2021. She invited all the Commissioners to attend. She believed it was a great opportunity to meet each other and share the functions of each committee or board.

10. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

None

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Michaud reported that the next scheduled meetings were on August 31, 2021 and September 7, 2021.

12. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Liepmann at 9:00 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Georgelos, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Paul Michaud, Secretary



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes - Final

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, August 3, 2021

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 Rose called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Deputy Town Attorney Deborah Robberson
Community Development Director Lisa Collins
Planning Manager Paul Michaud
Special Projects Planner Loras Rauch
Town Engineer Paul Mood

2. ROLL CALL

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

Absent 1 - Commissioner Charles Covington

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

A. [21-261](#) Continued 2022 General Plan discussion of the Goals and Policies within

the Community Character and Housing, Mobility, and Land Use and Growth Elements.

Loras Rauch, Special Projects Planner, explained the progress that had been done since the July meeting. She proposed a starting point and explained the changes. She listed the goals and elaborated on the policies.

Commissioner Locke asked about using the term “shall support” in Policies 1.2 and 2.6 under Community Character & Housing related to encouraging new development that respects and responds to the existing physical characteristics, drainage patterns etc.

Commissioner Liepmann agreed.

Commissioner Georgelos suggested rephrasing the above policies to permissive language such as the Town “may encourage”.

Commissioner Locke agreed.

Commissioner Locke asked about the comments in the residents’ survey of “peace, tranquility, and privacy” and use of these terms in the introduction section.

Ms. Rauch clarified there is more text for the introduction section of each Element that the Planning Commission will get later.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about defining the community culture and character.

Ms. Rauch explained that there is more text, but the main focus this evening is on the goals and policies.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about the wording in Policy 1.2 and suggested including the word “shall” in the text on the second part of the policy.

Commissioner Locke asked about certain statements in Policy 1.2 and suggested adding the words “to the Town Code” to the text.

Ms. Rauch confirmed that she understands the direction on Policy 1.2 and suggested they continue to the next goal.

Commissioner Locke asked about including the words “sustainable materials” into Policy 1.4.

Commissioner Georgelos agreed.

Chairman Rose also agreed and expounded on what constitutes sustainable materials.

Commissioner Liepmann agreed and suggested adding the concept or word “sustainable” into Policy 1.4.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about supporting design quality and sustainable material.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about environmental sustainability in addition to sustainable materials.

Chairman Rose agreed.

Commissioner Locke agreed as well.

Ms. Rauch made all of the notes and read the next goal.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the references to the Visually Significant Corridors Plan.

Ms. Rauch explained that the Town has adopted a master plan, which includes new language. She explained the changes that have been made to the policies.

Commissioner Locke asked about the language in Policy 2.5 in marketing the Town's unique character.

Chairman Rose agreed that the language is vague.

Commissioner Georgelos suggested they change the word "market" to "promote" in the text.

Commissioner Locke agreed.

Ms. Rauch noted the changes and asked if there are any further questions.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that the words "shall support" is a good addition to the text.

Ms. Rauch suggested moving on to the next goal. She read the next goal as it is written and summarized the policies.

Commissioner Liepmann stated that the added Policy 3.3 regarding that the Town shall monitor regulations that mitigate and limit impacts from the raising of lots/building pads on surrounding properties seems like a weak obligation. She stated that she's concerned about the word "monitor" in the text.

Ms. Rauch stated that the regulations are new and that's where the word "monitor" comes into play.

Commissioner Liepmann suggested revising the text to include the phrase "shall monitor regulations to mitigate and limit impacts" in the text.

Lisa Collins agreed with the suggested changes.

Ms. Rauch continued to the next goal. She read the goal as it is written and explained the policies. She stated that most of the policies have had minimal

changes.

Chairman Rose asked about the phrase "Town Campus" in Policy 4.1.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if "Town Campus" is a defined phrase.

Ms. Rauch explained what the Town Campus is and asked if the Commissioners would like the phrase to be listed among the defined terms.

Commissioner Georgelos suggested either defining it or elaborating on the phrase.

Commissioner Locke agreed that they should be more specific if it's not defined.

Chairman Rose asked about Policy 4.3 that states the Town shall encourage Special Use Permit properties to incorporate strategically located (e.g., accessible to surrounding neighborhoods) community gathering spaces that include small and appropriately scaled community-oriented services or amenities designed to support the interaction of Town residents and what that refers to.

Ms. Rauch stated that it applies to any nonresidential amendments that are required through a special use permit.

Chairman Rose stated that there is no town square, so the resorts act as gathering places. He wondered if the policy should be clearer.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that special use permit term is an umbrella term for places where people gather.

Lisa Collins stated that the phrase "Town Hall Campus" may be a more clarifying term.

Commissioner Nassikas agreed to support the phrase "Town Hall Campus."

Ms. Rauch continued to the next goal. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies. She stated that Policy 5.4 that reads the Town will continue to evaluate opportunities to work with State lawmakers to address community concerns regarding short term rentals in the community is an addition.

Commissioner Liepmann expressed concerns about Policy 5.4. She stated that the Town's obligations should be more than evaluating opportunities and working with state lawmakers.

Ms. Rauch stated that cities and towns used to have the ability to regulate short term rentals; however, the state law changed that. She stated that this is the reason for working with the state lawmakers in this way.

Commissioner Liepmann suggested rewording it.

Commissioner Georgelos agreed to reword to continue to address short term rentals in the community and keep it broad.

Regarding Policies 5.1 and 5.2, Commissioner Campbell asked about other residential lots that are less than one acre like the cluster plan without a special use permit.

Commissioner Liepmann suggested changing 5.1 and 5.2.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about addressing other issues under this goal, giving an example of white roofs.

Ms. Rauch stated that this particular goal talks about the types of housing. She stated that the suggested changes is best under Policy 5.1 regarding the character of the housing.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about white roofs being included in the sustainable materials.

Ms. Rauch continued onto the Circulation Element. She read the first goal as it is written and summarized the policies. She stated that this goal and policies had more changes than others.

Lisa Collins stated that it may be best to start with existing motorized circulation routes.

Commissioner Locke asked about enforcing traffic laws and traffic violations for the bicyclists' safety.

Ms. Rauch stated that Policy 1.8 would cover bicyclists. She suggested moving to the next goal. She read the goal as written and summarized the policies.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the definition of the word 'roadway' and what that entails.

Ms. Rauch clarified 'roadway' as anything within the public right-of-way, including bike lanes and sidewalks. She stated that intent is for the Town to assign specific aspects of the roadway on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Locke asked about traffic congestion becoming an increasing concern with the residents.

Lisa Collins stated that they would use a traffic impact analysis to address high density congestion.

Ms. Rauch stated many of the policies have been combined or eliminated. She continued to the next goal. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies. She stated that the policies have been revised or combined with other policies.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about the wording of Policy 3.2 that reads the Town shall promote shuttle and/or special event transit services for resort visitors during high season and/or valley-wide events. Vehicles shall be restricted as possible to major and minor arterial streets and be absent of excessive or distracting external advertising., specifically the word “promote”. She suggested it be changed to “support”.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the Town gets involved in promoting resorts and shuttle options. He stated that he is comfortable with the word “promote.”

Commissioner Georgelos agreed that the word “promote” works well in this instance.

Commissioner Liepmann suggested changing the word “promote” to “encourage”.

All Commissioners agreed that “encourage” is a better word.

Commissioner Campbell asked about Policy 3.1 and future public transit along Lincoln Drive

Commissioner Liepmann suggested including the phrase “including along Tatum Boulevard”.

Commissioner Nassikas noted that the bus stops on Tatum Boulevard is too far from many resort.

There was suggestion to change Tatum Boulevard to major arterials.

Ms. Rauch continued to the next goal on environmental impacts. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies.

Commissioner Campbell asked if this would be an appropriate place to add something about sustainable materials.

Commissioner Locke agreed.

Ms. Rauch continued to the next goal on visual character. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about environmental concerns and being open to new technological advances as they relate to climate change and sustainable roadway designs.

Commissioner Campbell asked about Policy 5.10 and having safe and maintainable streets.

Commissioner Georgelos agreed.

Ms. Rauch stated that they have made it through all of the Mobility goals and

policies.

Commissioner Campbell inquired about land use and what an LID is.

Ms. Rauch defined LID as a low-impact design.

Commissioner Campbell suggested spelling it out in the plan.

Chairman Rose asked whether to continue land use tonight or if the Commissioners would prefer to defer to the next meeting.

Chairman Rose agreed to continue talking about land use in this meeting.

Ms. Rauch continued to the first goal on quality of life. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies. She stated that there have been minimal changes to the policies.

Commissioner Liepmann asked whether Policy 1.7 that reads coordinate new development and land use within adjoining jurisdictions with existing and planned development along Town boundary edges is a shall or a should.

Ms. Rauch stated that it's up to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Campbell suggested that they change it to "shall".

Ms. Rauch noted the changes.

Commissioner Liepmann suggested that Policy 1.9 be changed to "shall".

Ms. Rauch noted the changes.

Chairman Rose asked for clarification for Policy 1.2 that reads the Town shall preserve a streetscape that is visually open to large yards and limited walls setback from the road and the preservation of native desert landscaping.

Ms. Rauch expounded upon Policy 1.2 regarding boundaries.

Chairman Rose asked about the phrase "limited walls".

Commissioner Campbell stated that the phrase "limited walls setbacks" is confusing.

Ms. Rauch stated that this discussion may be better held when talking about specifics.

Commissioner Campbell suggested clarifying the phrase "limited walls setback".

Commissioner Georgelos agreed.

Ms. Rauch agreed to work on that sentence.

Commissioner Locke suggested including the phrase “large front yards” in the text.

Commissioner Liepmann suggested using the word “perimeter”.

Ms. Rauch stated that they would see this again with a new draft. She continued to the next goal. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies.

Commissioner Locke suggested that Policy 2.4 that reads ensure that construction projects are completed in a timely manner with minimal impact on surrounding residences, including minimizing the visual, traffic, dust, noise and odor impacts related to the on-site schedule of work, location of temporary facilities, and placement of construction materials and debris. be changed to “shall”.

Commissioner Liepmann suggested rephrasing “native landscaping” to “drought tolerant native landscaping”.

Ms. Rauch asked for a preference for consistency.

Commissioner Georgelos agreed.

Commissioner Campbell for clarification on a policy.

Ms. Rauch explained that the policy has been deleted. She continued to the next goal on growth areas. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies.

Commissioner Georgelos asked for more background about special use permit property establishment.

Ms. Rauch gave examples.

Paul Michaud stated that they could remove the word “establishments” in the goal to clarify.

Ms. Rauch continued to the next goal on community spaces. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies. She explained that the consultant is in the process of wording the types of open spaces in Paradise Valley.

Ms. Rauch continued to the next goal on efficient infrastructure. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies. She stated that the land use element is a sort of umbrella element.

Ms. Rauch continued to the last land use goal on revitalization. She read the goal as it is written and summarized the policies.

Commissioner Campbell asked about the shading in the text.

Ms. Rauch stated that the shading is to clarify where the text should be.

Commissioner Campbell clarified what the intent was of the text.

Ms. Rauch stated that there has been some discussion on the project team on whether to keep the text and, if so, where to put it.

Commissioner Campbell supported keeping the text.

Commissioner Georgelos agreed.

Ms. Rauch asked for any further questions or remarks. She stated that the next four elements would be discussed at the August 17, 2021 work session.

No Reportable Action

B. [21-263](#)

Consideration of Proposed Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations for Walls, View Fences and Combination View Fences

Lisa Collins reviewed the proposal. She stated that the goal is to have a recommendation provided to the Town Council. She explained the purpose of the code amendment. She reviewed what is currently allowed in front and side yards adjacent to roadways.

Commissioner Campbell asked about whether the hedge is allowed.

Ms. Collins stated that the current code would allow a low wall without the wrought iron and a hedge. She stated that if it's a combination view fence, there could not be a hedge.

Commissioner Campbell clarified that the image being presented doesn't adhere to the current code.

Ms. Collins reviewed the comments from last meeting. She stated that there are certain limitations to landscaping and that special use permits may come into play. She explained why the code is the way it is now.

Chairman Rose noted that there is a considerable amount of conversation about landscaping. He asked about being more vigilant.

Ms. Collins stated that the hillside is a different zoning classification. She stated that the code requirements might differ some between hillside homes and flat land homes.

Chairman Rose asked about the impact of landscaping.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he's only supportive of the changes if they get a handle on landscaping. He stated that he doesn't understand the existing code because he doesn't see much of it happening in practice.

Ms. Collins stated that there has been no code enforcement on the landscaping unless there is a safety issue.

Commissioner Campbell stated that it may well be a matter of safety and open street view. He stated that he's skeptical about changing anything in the code if the Town is not enforcing the current code.

Ms. Collins explained the current requirement for view fences and landscaping. She suggested it be moved to a separate area of code. She stated that she agrees with Commissioner Campbell. She presented a street view map. She presented the current and proposed code.

Chairman Rose asked whether they'd already made a decision on the collector street. He clarified that the two big things they need to make a decision about are the major arterials and the minor arterials.

Ms. Collins stated that major arterials and minor arterials differ somewhat.

Chairman Rose asked about the original code and the suggested differences.

Ms. Collins clarified.

Commissioner Campbell stated that they were given a hierarchy of walls. He stated that the three categories would be enough to cover it. He asked why the combination view fence was not addressed.

Chairman Rose asked for the opinions of the other Commissioners.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he doesn't like it because they're not getting any landscaping enforcement. He stated that he's discouraged by the inability to enforce the code in this area.

Ms. Collins stated that it gets a little odd. She stated that it's a little bit contradictory.

Commissioner Campbell stated that there appears to be some discrepancies between what's listed in the code and what's seen in the town.

Ms. Collins stated that they need a recommendation from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he is concerned about variety.

Ms. Collins stated that the view fences are more like subdivision walls and not necessarily in peoples' front yards.

Commissioner Campbell disagreed. He asked whether walls were reviewed.

Ms. Collins confirmed that walls are reviewed.

Commissioner Locke stated that she understands Commissioner Campbell's perspective on landscaping not being enforced. She inquired about the right-of-way. She asked whether there could be some sort of parameters to the right-of-way.

Ms. Collins explained the average situation with a right-of-way. She stated that there could be situations where there is a request to the Board of Adjustment. She stated that, more frequently, there isn't enough right-of-way. She clarified the footage for major and minor arterials.

Commissioner Campbell clarified that the footage is split between each side of the street.

Chairman Rose asked to hear from the Commissioners regarding major arterials.

Commissioner Nassikas stated that he agrees with the staff's suggestions.

Commissioner Campbell asked about meandering sidewalks and lot lines.

Ms. Collins stated that there's about 45 feet of improvement so there's about 20 feet of back of sidewalk.

Commissioner Liepmann agreed with the 10-foot minimum setback is appropriate for major arterials.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that many of these issues are negligible.

Chairman Rose asked for clarification.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that she's not supportive of the changes.

Chairman Rose asked if Commissioner Georgelos would be supportive of more landscaping enforcement.

Ms. Collins suggested that they move into the action item. She stated that there may not be enough support for this to move forward. She stated that there could be comments along with the motion or recommendation to inform the Council.

Commissioner Campbell stated that they should come to a consensus.

Ms. Collins suggested they continue.

Commissioner Locke suggested including variants.

Commissioner Campbell disagreed with the changes.

Commissioner Liepmann stated that she's in favor of some of the changes, but not others.

Ms. Collins stated that the Commissioners can vote line by line if they like during the hearing portion.

Commissioner Locke stated that she's in favor of creative ideas. She stated that she would like to talk through it.

Commissioner Campbell suggested compromising.

Chairman Rose asked how many people would support a compromise of 15 feet for major arterials.

Commissioner Nassikas agreed to support the compromise.

Commissioner Campbell agreed to support the compromise.

Commissioner Liepmann agreed to support the compromise.

Commissioner Locke agreed to support the compromise.

Chairman Rose agreed to support the compromise.

Commissioner Georgelos disagreed.

Commissioner Campbell stated that they'd reached a consensus with the major arterials, but not the minor arterials. He stated that the same things that make the majors desirable would make the minors desirable.

Chairman Rose asked about "N/A" on the presentation.

Ms. Collins stated that it doesn't have its own requirements.

Commissioner Campbell asked about meandering walls.

Commissioner Nassikas asked for clarification about meandering walls in the minor arterials at 15 feet.

Ms. Collins stated that the other walls are see-thru so they're allowed a different footage.

Commissioner Campbell suggested a hierarchy for the walls.

Commissioner Nassikas agreed.

Commissioner Locke asked about feedback from residents about meandering walls.

Ms. Collins stated that she has not received any feedback about meandering walls.

Commissioner Campbell explained his proposed hierarchy of walls.

Commissioner Locke agreed to support Commissioner Campbell's ideas.

Commissioner Liepmann agreed. She stated that she has concerns about the hedges with combination view fences.

Chairman Rose asked about combination view fences and landscaping.

Commissioner Liepmann asked about defining landscaping hedges.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he'd like to make amendments to paragraph D.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about oleander hedges, view fences, and meandering walls and how they relate to the original goal.

Chairman Rose asked if a majority was reached for major arterials and minor arterials.

Commissioner Campbell suggested a compromise. He suggested 20 feet for the view fence, 20 feet for the combination view fence, 30 feet for the meandering, and 40 feet for the remaining walls.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that they need to be certain that this is what they want because they won't be able to take it back.

Chairman Rose asked about the reason for changing the codes.

Ms. Collins stated that there was one home that precipitated the discussion, which led to the need for clarity in the code.

Chairman Rose asked about working on the verbiage rather than the numbers.

Ms. Collins stated that the proposed draft is a reorganized version of the current code. She stated that the numbers need clarifying as well as making it less cumbersome to understand.

Chairman Rose asked if there is a way to make things more succinct.

Ms. Collins stated that the language and the chart that has been put together is more succinct.

Commissioner Locke stated that the chart is very helpful. She asked about referencing the chart to the content of the document.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that she is supportive of the reformat. She stated that things should be as clear as possible. She stated that she disagrees with the changes to the numbers.

Commissioner Campbell asked about amendments to the amendment. He suggested deferring the public hearing until the next meeting.

Chairman Rose asked whether everyone agrees.

Ms. Collins stated that the draft code would include the chart as well as the reformatted written word.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he would like to continue speaking on the

subject.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that it's imperative that there are no inconsistencies.

Commissioner Campbell suggested a compromise.

Commissioner Nassikas agreed with the proposed changes.

Commissioner Liepmann agreed with the proposed changes.

Commissioner Campbell stated that he would like to spend some time reviewing paragraph D, but not tonight.

Commissioner Georgelos stated that the walls, fences, and landscaping should all be looked at together because they work together.

Chairman Rose suggested making a comment to the Council.

No Reportable Action

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. [21-262](#) Consideration of Proposed Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations for Walls, View Fences and Combination View Fences

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Georgelos, to continue Item 21-262, Consideration of proposed Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations for walls, view fences, and combination view fences. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Covington

6. ACTION ITEMS

None

7. CONSENT AGENDA

- A. [21-260](#) Approval of the July 20, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Liepmann, seconded by Commissioner Georgelos, to approve the July 20, 2021 minutes. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Covington

8. STAFF REPORTS

None

9. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

None

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Michaud reported that the next meeting was on August 17, 2021 with a public hearing on walls and fences as well as a general plan to discuss 4 elements.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Georgelos at 10:06 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Nassikas, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Covington

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Paul Michaud, Secretary



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes - Final

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, July 20, 2021

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

Planning Commission

Minutes - Final

July 20, 2021

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Town Attorney Andrew McGuire
Community Development Director Lisa Collins
Senior Planner George Burton
Town Engineer Paul Mood
Special Projects Planner Loras Rauch

2. ROLL CALL

Present 7 - Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner William Nassikas
Commissioner James Rose

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

A. [21-254](#) 2022 General Plan discussion of the Vision Statement and the Goals and Policies within the Land Use and Growth, Mobility, and Community Character and Housing Elements.

Matt Klyszeiko, Michael Baker International Representative, remarked that the current vision statement was good and well supported by residents, but he sees some adjustments to the formatting. He suggested that some of the information contained in the first few paragraphs of the current vision statement fit better in a prologue.

Commissioner Georgelos commented that she believed they were going in a good direction and supported the idea of the prologue to set things up. She stated that she liked the new language in the vision statement and the continued focus on low density housing.

Chairman Rose inquired if the phrase, "recognizing a proper balance between individual property rights and the powers of local government," in the vision statement included any work on short term rentals.

Mr. Klyszeiko replied that the vision statement did not go into specific topics such as short-term rentals, noting this is a topic that is important to residents. He suggested that the entire third paragraph relates back to that specific topic.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if that paragraph should be placed further down where details could be further fleshed out.

Mr. Klyszeiko responded that there is a lot of flexibility on how to structure the vision statement. He noted that those who had worked on the vision statement originally felt it better fit early in the vision statement.

Commissioner Covington stated that he would like to see the first phrase of the third paragraph deleted since it gives a negative view of local government.

Lisa Collins, Community Development Director, informed the Commission that the portion being discussed was currently in the vision statement and not put in by the consultant.

Commissioner Locke inquired if the thought is to keep an introduction portion of the General Plan.

Mr. Klyszeiko indicated yes.

Chairman Rose asked if ideas such as 5G technology, low impact development, and environmental impacts are included in the vision statement.

Mr. Klyszeiko reiterated that the purpose of the vision statement is not at a granular level to address things such as 5G, but instead has a broader statement about how development services will evolve and change to allow the community to meet the social and economic needs of the day while sustaining the sense of place and character that makes the town unique.

Commissioner Georgelos suggested to add the phrase “to meet the social, environmental, and economic needs of today” and possibly “technology” as well.

Mr. Klyszeiko explained that they had originally thought of things such as 5G as a social and economic aspect. He noted there was some apprehension to incorporating the term technology since there could be negative aspects to incorporating it.

Chairman Rose reiterated that he believed adding the terms environmental and technology would make things clearer.

Mr. Klyszeiko remarked that the exact language is not the purpose this evening, instead it is for a general idea that could be refined as the plan moves forward. He reviewed a list of existing goals in the general plan that were voted on by Council and the Commission. He noted that the Council and the Commission mostly agreed on which goals should be kept, and which should be changed except for a few which he highlighted. He noted the generalized track changes described in the Commission’s packets. He asked if there were any questions regarding the goals and policies for the land use section.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if LU 2.1.1.2 was eliminated since the information was addressed somewhere else in the plan.

Mr. Klyszeiko indicated that was correct.

Loras Rauch, Special Projects Planner, stated she could get copies of the complete track changes to the Commission to view on their own time.

Mr. Klyszeiko requested feedback from the Commission concerning a portion addressing assisted living in Paradise Valley.

Commissioner Campbell remarked that he was not sure it was appropriate to include it in this addition of the plan.

Commissioner Covington noted there was state laws that addressed this issue and did not believe they needed to include language that would impact those state laws.

Mr. Klyszeiko inquired if the Commission had feedback on if community form and design should be under land use or community character.

Commissioner Locke asked if there was a definition for the term community space and open space.

Mr. Klyszeiko indicated that his team is working with staff regarding recreation and open space and will discuss that more at the August 17th work session.

Commissioner Liepmann inquired if the plan should make all the “shall” and “should” terms consistent, or if there was reasoning behind the use of the different words.

Mr. Klyszeiko replied that in most cases there was intent behind the use of the word shall or should. He noted that shall was more definitive. He requested discussion on replacing goals and policies concerning development areas with the section regarding managing growth through the special use permit zoning process.

Commissioner Georgelos remarked that she believed this was a good change. She pointed out that during the 2012 General Plan process the Town was in a different place and needed more redevelopment than it does now.

Mr. Klyszeiko reviewed the mobility section of the draft general plan, noting that it has the most change of the sections reviewed this evening. He indicated there was a lot of feedback concerning alternative modes of mobility within Paradise Valley and a suggestion future mobility projects be looked at on a case-by-case basis. As such, he stated that the draft plan reworks the more detailed existing goals and policies to speak more holistically to multimodal circulation.

Commissioner Georgelos remarked that it was appropriate that the Commission look at the multimodal circulation plan, but noted there had been a lot of changes and did not want to rush through those this evening.

Mr. Klyszeiko pointed out that most of what was removed from the mobility section was due to redundant policies. He noted that notes in the comments of the draft indicate what sections the removed portions had been incorporated into.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about feedback received regarding traffic calming techniques such as roundabouts.

Mr. Klyszeiko explained that roundabouts often help traffic flow smoother and noted that staff received comments about queuing occurring in roundabouts blocking traffic. He shared that the draft plan will advocate for using traffic calming measures with the understanding that there will be situations such traffic calming measures may not be the most beneficial. He indicated that by using terms such as should rather than shall in this section may be most appropriate.

Mr. Klyszeiko recommend that the Commission come back with any other specific observations on the mobility and land use sections at the August 3 meeting.

Chairman Rose asked if any of the public had questions or comments. No comments were made.

No Reportable Action

B. [21-256](#)

Consideration of Proposed Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations for Walls, View Fences and Combination View Fences

Ms. Collins gave a presentation on the proposed changes to the wall and fence

ordinance. She reviewed the types of walls and fences currently allowed in front and side yards adjacent to roadways including view fences, meandering walls, combination view fences, walls, and landscape hedges. She noted that generally the proposed changes only impact major and minor arterials and collector roads. She indicated the proposed amendment reduces the setback along minor arterials and collectors from 20 feet to 10 feet for view fences and combination view fences. She noted that she would like the Commission to reconsider the restriction on landscape hedges in the current code. She explained that landscape hedges are restricted to three feet in height when done in conjunction with a combination view fence.

Commissioner Locke noted there was a section that indicated hedges or oleanders could be installed at the property line to allow for more privacy.

Ms. Collins indicated the proposed amendment could reference that section in the wall and fence portion of the code if the Commission desired.

Commissioner Campbell stated when the current code on walls and fences was developed, the Commission and Council concluded the town did not have much open space other than the roadways and the rights-of-way and setbacks associated with them. He explained that the Town allowed for walls to be built closer to the rights-of-way when they had more desirable characteristics such as a meandering wall or combination view fence. He expressed that he felt these provisions worked well over the last 10-15 years with the current ordinance. He noted that the code provision should address landscaping requirements.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if the intent is allowing views and more desert vegetation or if the intent is to move away from that with this code amendment.

Ms. Collins indicated many people come in to ask questions about where their walls and fences since the code is convoluted.

Commissioner Liepmann asked if the Commission could deny the recommendation.

Ms. Collins explained the Commission can recommend approval, denial, or some other configuration to Council. She indicated that she is working with the Town attorneys to address possible solutions for some of the unique cases which may require administrative discretion.

Commissioner Locke inquired if there was a rights-of-way standard map to help determine the setback for future development or expansion.

Ms. Collins stated that the general plan includes cross sections to show what the right-of-way requirements are for each road classification.

Commissioner Campbell suggested using a different standard to measure the setbacks from, such as the back of the curb.

Ms. Collins noted it was a complicated issue and that she would investigate this

more.

Commissioner Georgelos expressed that the Commission needs to focus on how they want their town and roadways to look like when they make their decision.

Commissioner Campbell inquired why the regulations regarding hedges are difficult to enforce.

Ms. Collins explained that the Town staff could enforce it, but it is more difficult due to the limited manpower and the fact that plants grow.

Commissioner Campbell asked if people were required to have a hedge maintenance agreement when they get a view fence.

Ms. Collins stated they would only have one if they were planting hedges, but noted that they did not require residential landscape plans. She noted that if the Commission desired, staff could suggest that to Council, but pointed out that would require a different code change.

Commissioner Campbell pointed out that most of the view fences and combination view fences have hedges right behind them that do not comply. He suggested that if they allow fences to be put closer to the right-of-way, they need to ensure these comply with the openness described in paragraph D.

Commissioner Campbell recommended for no changes to the collector streets.

Commissioner Covington and Locke agreed.

Commissioner Georgelos indicated that she agreed as well, but did not believe the Town needs to make changes to the major or minor arterials as well.

Commissioner Nassikas inquired where setbacks were measured from.

Ms. Collins replied setbacks were currently measured from the edge of right-of-way.

Commissioner Covington indicated that he did not want to change the code as proposed.

Commissioner Campbell stated he would like to see if there was something they could do to give people less setback but more openness on the minor arterials.

Ms. Collins recommended bringing this item back to the Commission at the next meeting to provide a recommendation to Council and allow them to move forward with the proposed text change. She noted that the Commission could specifically suggest for Council to look at landscaping regulations for residential lots.

Chairman Rose suggested they revisit the item again at their August 3rd

meeting to which several members of the Commission agreed. He inquired if they could make a recommendation on landscaping or not.

Ms. Collins stated they could recommend Council make an amendment to the landscaping code.

Chairman Rose asked if any members of the community would like to make a comment. No comments were made.

No Reportable Action

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

6. ACTION ITEMS

None

7. CONSENT AGENDA

A. [21-243](#) Approval of the June 1, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Covington, seconded by Commissioner Campbell, to approve the June 1, 2021 minutes with two edits. Correct the spelling of rationale on page 3 and modify the text on page 4 to read "Commissioner Georgelos commented that she did not see a need for the approval of the name could be changed..." The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

B. [21-252](#) Approval of the June 15, 2021 Planning Commission Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Liepmann, seconded by Commissioner Covington, to approve the June 15, 2021 minutes with an edit to page 4 on the continued date to read August 3, 2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

8. STAFF REPORTS

None

9. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

Commissioner Campbell inquired if staff was aware of the land use elements, specifically requirements for diversified housing options, that are in the current infrastructure legislation in Washington DC. He indicated that he was nervous they may be forced to look at higher density or Section 8 housing to get federal

funding.

Ms. Collins stated that she has seen those, but was unsure how it would impact Paradise Valley. She indicated they would investigate it further and provide them with an update.

10. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Collins announced that the August 3rd meeting would include a continuation on this evening's General Plan update and walls and fences discussion/hearing.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell at 9:08 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Covington, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Covington, Commissioner Georgelos, Commissioner Liepmann, Commissioner Locke, Commissioner Nassikas and Commissioner Rose

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Paul Michaud, Secretary



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes - Final

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, June 15, 2021

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 Rose called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. after waiting for additional Planning Commission Members to join the meeting.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Town Attorney Andrew J. McGuire
Community Development Director Lisa Collins
Planning Manager Paul Michaud
Town Engineer Paul Mood

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioner Liepmann entered the meeting at 6:16 p.m.. Commissioner Nassikas entered the meeting at 6:26 p.m. Commissioner Covington left the meeting approximately 7:00 p.m.

Present 7 - Commissioner Thomas G. Campbell
Commissioner Charles Covington
Commissioner Pamela Georgelos
Commissioner Karen Liepmann
Commissioner Kristina Locke
Commissioner William Nassikas
Commissioner James Rose

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION

None

4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

A. [21-233](#) 2022 General Plan project status update, review of community feedback, and discussion of the Vision and Value Statements.

Mr. Klyszeiko, Michael Baker International Representative, provided an update on the General Plan project which began in October 2020. He indicated that his team is taking information they have gathered from the community and other resources and were now in the process of starting a draft document. He indicated his team will bring back draft portions to the Planning Commission throughout the summer and hopefully have a complete plan draft ready to share with the public at the end of the summer. He noted that the Planning Commission will have more time later to refine the plan before going through the public hearing and having Council adopt the plan to be put on the ballot for the community to vote on in August 2022. He indicated that the Planning Commission work sessions for this phase will be June 15, July 20, and August 17.

Mr. Klyszeiko reviewed the results of the community surveys and noted that survey results are on the project website. He shared that the survey included information on what people liked best about the community, negative trends in the community, and detailed feedback on the current General Plan among other things. He then provided a summary of the discussion hubs on Mobility and Connectivity, Quality of Life, and Additional Key Topics: short term rentals, raising of lots/building pads, cell service, and storm water management.

Commissioner Locke remarked that she understood that there were approximately 15,000 residences in Paradise Valley and 386 participants only made up 2% of the population. She asked how they selected residents and why their numbers showed much higher percentage results.

Mr. Klyszeiko explained that the survey was made available to all residents. He shared that the confidence level looks at the population relative to the total surveys. He noted he could provide more information on the equation if desired.

Commissioner Locke inquired why privacy and limited government were not included in the survey when they were identified as important issues to the community in a study performed in March 2010.

Mr. Klyszeiko stated this is on the next slides. He reported that the survey asked residents how they feel about the values identified in the previous General Plan effort and found that while residents still supported some elements, they felt others needed to be removed or revised. He noted that most residents believed limited government meant minimal regulation, fiscal sustainability, minimal taxation, and only providing essential services.

Commissioner Georgelos asked about the efforts made and planned to get people involved with the project.

Mr. Klyszeiko replied that outreach was an important aspect of the project. He indicated the public involvement plan is on the project website and identified how the Town will engage public in the project. He pointed out this outreach included community workshops, discussion hubs, community survey,

information booth, and the website, among other means to gather information from the community.

Commissioner Georgelos indicated it may be helpful to think of other ways to inform and encourage the community to participate.

Mr. Klyszeiko presented a revised version of the 2011 vision statement and asked what comments they had and what adjustments they felt needed to be made. He noted that this vision statement would help guide the General Plan revision process over the summer.

Commissioner Liepmann inquired if she should make suggested revisions at this time or at a later meeting.

Lisa Collins, Community Development Director, stated that she could make comments at this time and at future meetings as well.

Mr. Klyszeiko pointed out that the Planning Commission feedback will help in the drafting process. This will allow the Town Council to understand the work the Commission did over the summer prior to the next community workshop in late September. He added that the final draft of the General Plan which will go through a 60-day review process followed by a final public hearing.

Commissioner Rose inquired where the short-term rentals, pad heights, and storm water management would be included in the plan.

Mr. Klyszeiko pointed out that the General Plan is holistic, but noted there are several ways to include references to those things if the Planning Commission believed they are an important enough topic.

Ms. Collins recommended the Commission gives staff concept and ideas, and staff will work on the wordsmithing to include those suggestions.

Commissioner Campbell noted he would like to see new technology addressed in the plan.

Commissioner Nassikas stated they needed to be mindful of their future from an environmental perspective.

Commissioner Georgelos remarked that she believed it would be prudent for them to take some time to digest the vision statement and make sure that is what they want and there is nothing else to add.

Commissioner Campbell remarked that much of the community outreach was done during the pandemic and inquired about opportunities that were not available such as in-person outreach.

Ms. Collins expressed that the second workshop in September is tentatively set as an in-person open house workshop.

Commissioner Georgelos remarked that it was important to get as much

community involvement every step of the way.

Mr. Klyszeiko requested that the Planning Commission submit their recommendations to Loras Rauch and that information would be worked into the report for them to review at their next meeting on July 20th.

Commissioner Georgelos requested that staff indicate to the Commission what will specifically be discussed and what feedback is requested before each meeting.

No Reportable Action

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. [21-237](#) Consideration of Proposed Zoning Ordinance regarding regulations for Walls, View Fences and Combination View Fences

Ms. Collins requested that the Planning Commission continue the item to July 20, 2021.

Chairman Rose called for any public comments on the proposed zoning ordinance.

Jennifer Polera indicated she lived on the lot at the southeast corner of Lincoln Drive and Mockingbird Lane. She commented that there is a lot of traffic in front of her home and desired to have additional privacy. She indicated it was concerning to see the proposed addition of hedges to the wall ordinance since she planted and intended to plant more to create additional privacy. She clarified that the proposed amendment will not allow her to plant or build anything taller than three feet for privacy.

He closed the public comment period.

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Nassikas, to continue the public hearing on the text amendment regarding regulations for walls and fences to the July 20, 2021 regular meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Covington

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Nassikas, to reconsider the motion in an effort to provide opportunity to have a work session prior to the rescheduled public hearing. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Covington

A motion was made by Commissioner Campbell, seconded by Commissioner Liepmann, to continue the public hearing on the text amendment regarding regulations for walls and fences to the August 3, 2021 regular meeting. The

motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Covington

6. STUDY SESSION ITEMS (Continued)

A. [21-236](#) Discussion of a Zoning Ordinance text amendment regarding regulations for Wall and Fences

Ms. Collins presented an overview of the zoning ordinance text amendment which included the purpose of the code amendment to increase clarity, simplicity, options, and privacy and security. She listed what was currently allowed in front and side yards adjacent to roadways and provided examples. She noted some of the specific suggested changes, including allowing combination and view fences at the 10-foot setback and oleander hedges allowed at the 10-foot setback or closer to the roadway. She pointed out that she is not suggesting any modifications on local streets which make up most of the streets in town.

Commissioner Nassikas inquired if the oleanders were simply the preferred term of vegetation and if other plants such as sour oranges or other plants could be used.

Ms. Collins clarified plants other than oleanders could be used to make hedges.

Commissioner Locke remarked that 10-foot setbacks could help with aesthetics in terms of maintenance and would allow the property owner to use more of their land.

Jim Kuykendall, resident, asked if the setbacks were impacted by the size of the lot.

Ms. Collins replied that setbacks for walls and fences are the same and based on street classification.

Commissioner Georgelos requested additional clarification on properties with lot lines in the center of the right-of-way versus properties with lot lines on the edge of the right-of-way.

Ms. Collins noted that in those unique situations where the property line does not line up with the edge of the right-of-way, staff will have to make an interpretation and will most likely measure the setback from the edge of the right-of-way.

Commissioner Campbell noted that one of the goals behind the development of the current code was to maintain and improve the quality of the Town's open spaces. He expressed concern about fences not lining up on neighboring lots along streets with different setbacks for fences and hedges.

Commissioner Georgelos pointed out that the Planning Commission should consider these changes carefully since once they allow the proposed additional options it would be difficult to take them away.

Ms. Collins agreed that it would be difficult to change back, but noted that it would offer more variety in wall and fencing options to property owners.

Chairman Rose asked if a property like Ms. Polera’s could have a hedge higher than three feet in front of a view fence.

Ms. Collins replied that the current code will not allow for that. She noted that the current vegetation in front of Ms. Polera’s view fence was not considered a hedge.

Commissioner Liepmann asked if Ms. Polera’s property would be allowed some sort of variance due to the proposed sidewalk being placed next to her property.

Ms. Collins responded that an application for a variance could be submitted. She acknowledged that Ms. Polera’s property was unique. She remarked that she would follow up with Ms. Polera regarding removing some of the landscaping outside her three-foot tall view fence to put in a meandering sidewalk.

Commissioner Campbell remarked that he would rather not change miles of streetscape and open space to deal with a few lots with special conditions. He clarified that he was against the proposed changes along collector roads, but is more sympathetic to the changes along minor arterials.

Ms. Collins explained the next step is for the Planning Commission to review the text amendment at their next meeting at which point they would make a recommendation to the Town Council.

Discussion was made on when the Commission could have another work session on the item before a decision and recommendation was made to Council. It was determined a vote to reconsider the earlier July 20th continued public hearing date to August 3rd was in order.

No Reportable Action

7. ACTION ITEMS

None

8. CONSENT AGENDA

None

9. STAFF REPORTS

None

10. PUBLIC BODY REPORTS

None

11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Paul Michaud indicated that the July 6, 2021 meeting would be cancelled and the July 20, 2021 meeting agenda would include a work session on walls and fences as well as the General Plan.

12. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Commissioner Georgelos at 9:20 p.m., seconded by Commissioner Nassikas, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Commissioner Covington

Paradise Valley Planning Commission

By: _____
Paul Michaud, Secretary