



Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Minutes - Final

Hillside Building Committee

Wednesday, May 13, 2020

8:00 AM

Town Hall Boardroom

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

Committee Members

Chair Scott Jarson, Scott Tonn, Daran Wastchack, Charles Covington and James Anton.

1. Call to Order

The Hillside Building Review Committee met on Wednesday, May 13, 2020, at Town Hall, 6401 East Lincoln Drive, Paradise Valley, Arizona 85253. Committee Members present: Chair Scott Jarson, Scott Tonn, Daran Wastchack, Charles Covington and James Anton. Staff present: Hillside Development Administrator Hugo Vasquez. Chair Scott Jarson called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

2. Executive Session

None.

3. Application Review

[20-208](#)

Solar combined review for the residence at 6067 N Paradise View Drive (APN 164-04-074).

Hillside Development Administrator Hugo Vasquez gave a brief overview of the application. This application would add solar panels to this 8,600 square foot residence that was constructed in 2007. The application date was October 11, 2019. The applicants wanted to add 56 solar panels to their roof. The solar panel would be at a ten-degree tilt. The applicant was given a variance by the Board of Adjustment on October 2, 2019 to allow the solar panels to be free of any screening.

Leslie Yeary, the applicant, stated this plan was designed to be hidden from anywhere. It could not be seen at ground level or by the neighbors. They wanted

to put solar panels on their house to help keep the air clean.

Member Scott Tonn asked where the variance was, as he had not seen it. He wanted to know what the purpose of getting the variance was and why the variance had been approved.

Mr. Vasquez showed the Committee the variance document. He explained because the solar panels could not be seen and that they did not need to be screened. The variance was approved because the solar panels had a small visual impact, as they could not be seen. He showed a picture of the house to give the Committee a visual.

Ms. Yeary stated the solar panels were so hidden that adding parapets would make it more visible than if they did not add parapets.

Mr. Jarson asked if the applicant planned on resurfacing the roof.

Bobby Burnett, the applicant, stated they were not resurfacing the roof, because it was in good shape.

Mr. Jarson asked if the ten-degree incline was the lowest incline they could be at and still generate power.

Mr. Burnett replied ten degrees was the lowest incline a solar panel could have and still be able to generate power.

Member Charles Covington asked how they were waterproofing the roof penetrations that would occur with the mounting of the solar panels.

Mr. Burnett replied they would use a chemically matched foam to fill in the roof penetrations and create a bit of a dome so water would go away from those spots.

Mr. Covington asked where the inverters were located.

Mr. Vasquez replied most of the mechanical equipment was located in the garage, and there was some mechanical equipment on the east side of the home. It would be nicely hidden.

Mr. Jarson asked if there was anyone in the community that wanted to speak on this and there were none.

A motion was made by Chair Jarson, seconded by Committee Member Wastchak, to approve the Solar combined review for the residence at 6067 N Paradise View Drive (APN 164-04-074). The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Jarson, Tonn, Covington, Anton and Wastchak

20-209

Combined review for an enclosed dog run at 4700 E Charles Drive (APN 168-69-014).

Mr. Vasquez gave an overview of this application. This application was requesting approval to build an enclosed dog run next to the existing residence at 4700 E Charles Drive. This residence had been constructed in 2016. The dog run was classified as a sports court and it met all setback requirements on all sides. The fencing would be constructed from an approved material, natural steel that would rust over time. The proposed lighting would need to be looked at by the committee. They would be laying the synthetic turf on the natural ground and would not be regrading. There would be removal of some plants in that area, but all surrounding plants would remain undisturbed. The disturbed area would be approximated 51.3%, and they were allowed up to 60%.

Brent Armstrong, the applicant, stated the mature plants surrounding the disturbed area would cover the dog run. This would have minimal fencing.

Mr. Tonn asked if any neighbors had reach out with concerns.

Mr. Vasquez replied no one had contacted the City with concerns. One person had contacted the applicant wanting to prevent the applicant from owning a specific breed of dogs. This was beyond their control and there were no other concerns.

Mr. Wastchack commented the mature vegetation did a good job of hiding the dog run. The dog run would not be very visible.

Mr. Jarson asked the applicant why they chose the specific location in their yard for the dog run.

Mr. Armstrong replied one part of the lot had the septic system in it and another part of the lot would be into the setback area. The chosen area was the best location for the dog run.

Mr. Wastchack asked if it was necessary for the applicant to have the proper setbacks.

Mr. Vasquez replied the setbacks were necessary to compliant with the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Tonn asked about fencing for other houses that did not need it in regard to water safety.

Mr. Vasquez replied fencing was permittable for pools and sport courts.

Mr. Jarson stated the dog run was big. He wondered if it was necessary to have such a large area for the dogs.

Mr. Armstrong replied the dog run was only 30 feet by 50 feet. The space was

necessary, as the dogs were large.

Mr. Jarson commented he was worried about approving a large fenced area. He did not want to set precedence for future applications.

Mr. Tonn asked what the base was made of.

Mr. Armstrong replied the base would be constructed out of artificial turf.

Mr. Tonn understood Mr. Jarson's concerns. In the past, fences had only been approved for safety needs.

Mr. Jarson asked why the current yard did not work for the dogs.

Mr. Armstrong replied the yard was small and had objects such as grills that lessened the space. They also were trying to keep the dogs out of the pool.

Mr. Wastchak agreed with Mr. Jarson's concerns. He wondered if they could fence off the pool and extend the yard so the dogs could have the septic area. It would create pool safety and give the dogs an area.

Mr. Covington was concerned about the fence itself.

Mr. Jarson replied the proposed fencing was similar to the fencing in his own yard. It would rust and blend into the background well.

Mr. Covington asked how tall the fence would be. He also wondered about the lighting.

Mr. Armstrong replied the fencing height was in relation to the dog size. The fence would be five feet tall, which was the same height as a water safety fence. The lighting was meant to allow them to see just enough when it was dark outside. The lighting was minimal.

Mr. Tonn asked if this dog run would have to be specified as a sport court to be approved.

Mr. Vasquez replied that was correct, the dog run would have to be specified as a sport court.

Mr. Jarson asked if the applicant would be willing to consider putting the dog run on the east side of the lot.

Mr. Armstrong replied he would have to talk to the homeowners. It would not be ideal to build the dog run on the eastside of the property.

Mr. Tonn stated in order to be considered a sport court, it would have to be operated as a sport court. He thought Mr. Vasquez should look up the definition of the sport court and the minimum requirements in code to be considered a

sport court.

Mr. Vasquez looked at the code and it did not show any requirements to be considered a sport court.

Mr. Wastchak stated a sport court and a dog run had the same amount of disturbance. He wondered if the definition of sport court extended further than a fenced area for sports.

Mr. Jarson commented the Committee had a say in materials even if this was a tennis court. He did not understand why the dog run had to be in the middle of the property. He would prefer the dog run to be more connected to the use.

Mr. Armstrong replied they would be allowed to build a guest house in that area, but it would obstruct the view. His point was some things that were allowed were worse.

Mr. Jarson asked if the applicant had talked to the neighbor that could potentially see part of the dog run.

Mr. Armstrong replied the neighbor was okay with the construction of the dog run. They could use a brown turf to help with the look of the dog run.

Mr. Jarson and Mr. Covington were still concerned.

Mr. Jarson asked what the intent was for the dog run.

Mr. Armstrong replied the dog run would allow for the dogs to get exercise a couple hours a day with little supervision. It would only be used a few hours per day.

Mr. Anton commented the dog run was quite big and green.

Mr. Covington stated the dog run would be visible from the street.

Mr. Tonn thought it was an issue to use an unnatural color. It needed to blend in more and preferably be smaller.

Mr. Jarson wondered if the lighting was necessary.

Mr. Armstrong replied there would be a little light on the path and no light on the actual court.

Mr. Jarson asked if anyone on the Committee wished to speak on this application.

Ted Hoffstead, a citizen, stated he was familiar with Charles Drive. He thought the dog run was a reasonable use of the area.

Mr. Jarson commented, as submitted, he was not supportive of the application. He thought there was a better place to put the dog run with less disturbance.

Mr. Wastchak made a motion to continue the application 20-209 with the feedback given by the Committee, including finding materials to blend better, relocating the dog run to the east, and possibly making the dog run smaller.

Mr. Jarson asked if they approved the application today, with the stipulation of relocating the dog run and the stipulation of the Committee getting to choose the materials used.

Mr. Armstrong replied he could not say yes to that proposal, as he would need to talk to his clients first.

Mr. Jarson stated an alternative plan would be to have the application approved with the stipulation that the dog run could not exceed the smallest sport court size of 44 feet by 28 feet. They could also have the applicant bring back a materials sample for the Committee to approve. He asked what the rest of the Committee thought.

Mr. Wastchak replied he wanted to know what the rest of the Committee was thinking. He personally was fine with the location of the dog run but agreed with making the size smaller and having a say in the materials used.

Mr. Jarson asked if the applicant would be willing to reduce the size of the dog run to 44 feet by 28 feet.

Mr. Armstrong replied he could not be certain until he talked to his clients but thought they would be open to the idea of reducing the size to 44 feet by 28 feet.

Mr. Anton asked where the feet would be taken from if the sized were reduced.

Mr. Vasquez replied they could take the feet where they wanted, or the Committee could stipulate where the feet would be taken from.

Mr. Vasquez recommended they continue the application.

Mr. Armstrong agreed.

Mr. Anton seconded the motion Mr. Wastchak had made earlier.

Mr. Armstrong asked if they moved the location if they still had to keep the setbacks.

Mr. Vasquez replied they would still have to keep the setbacks.

A motion was made by Committee Member Wastchak, seconded by Committee Member Anton, to Continue the Combined review for an enclosed dog run at 4700 E Charles Drive to the June 10. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Jarson, Tonn, Covington, Anton and Wastchak

20-210

Concept review for a new single family residence at 5712 E Glen Drive (APN 169-55-026A).

Mr. Vasquez presented an overview of the proposal for a new 4600 square foot single-family residence. He noted that the application would be reviewed under the current regulations. He indicated that the site has an existing spill slope which left only a strip down the middle undisturbed. He explained that the owners grandfathered in a significant amount of disturbed area and planned to have approximately 71% site disturbance after the residence is constructed.

Stephan Mackos, Applicant Representative, stated that they planned to use the existing pad that was on the site but did plan to cut into the hill to the northeast including some fill that had been pushed down from a neighboring property. He noted that they were trying to limit excavation as much as possible.

Member Tonn asked if sonar had been performed on the existing pad to find out its composition.

Mr. Mackos replied that he did not believe their geotechnical provider had done sonar. He stated that he assumed some of the dirt was non compacted fill.

Chairperson Jarson noted that the site has taken a lot of water in the past and inquired what they planned to do in the future.

Mr. Mackos replied that the civil engineer planned for two horizontal storage tanks to catch water and release it slowly.

Mr. Nick Prodanov provided an overview of the drainage report. He noted that they had staggered retaining walls among other things to help the water follow historic flows. He shared that any onsite water would be retained through underground storage. He indicated that he believed their plans would slow the flow of water in a rain event from running directly onto the street. He clarified that he hoped to reduce the runoff from the property with the construction of the site.

Paul Mood, Town Engineer, reported that the neighbor to the east had previously built a rock berm on the south side of Glen Drive which cut off a wash inlet that has since been restored. He noted that restoration should alleviate some of the water that was flowing down Glen Drive.

Member Tonn asked if the east most flow would be affected by the retention apparatus for the building.

Mr. Prodanov responded that their intent was to detain the runoff on site and slowly release it back onto the natural historic path.

Member Tonn inquired where the water that was captured by the trench drain at

the base of the driveway would go.

Mr. Prodanov replied that it would be sent down the driveway into the underground retention pipe to be slowly released. He noted that the retention pipe would need to be placed low enough underground so the water would flow down into it from the driveway trench drain.

Mr. Mackos presented the materials they planned to use on the home. He indicated they wanted to use some exposed masonry on the southeast structure and the rest of the home would be a plaster stucco material. He explained the fascia would be black and a portion of the roof will be a metal finish, while the remainder of the roof would be foam with granular rock chips on top.

Chairperson Jarson noted that they have encouraged rock chip or ballasted roofs to help the structures blend in better from above. He cautioned the applicant to be careful about the LRV on their overhangs since they have had issues with white ceilings that were not appropriate in the past.

Member Covington asked about the glazing material.

Mr. Mackos indicated he did not have a lot of details on the glaze but understood that it was a coating to help reduce the reflectivity of the windows.

Chairperson Jarson requested that the applicant keep the location of any soffit lighting in mind so that it did not create architectural lighting on the face of the building.

Member Tonn noted that the actual bulbs in the soffit lighting needed to be recessed as much as possible so they would not be visible from below.

Chairperson Jarson inquired if they were considering a pool.

Mr. Mackos replied that they had plans for a pool on the south side.

Chairperson Jarson invited the applicant to look at the native topography and restore what they could along with doing some revegetation.

Member Wastchak asked if there was a sewer connection to the site.

Mr. Mackos remarked that the current plan was to do a septic system but had not investigated it closely.

Member Anton asked if they planned to install solar at some point.

Mr. Mackos indicated they had not discussed solar panels but noted there was opportunities for it on the flat upper-level roof.

Joe Reese, Applicant, remarked that he did plan on some solar installation. He

indicated that he would also like to do a negative edge pool if it was doable and did not negatively impact the neighborhood.

Chairperson Jarson asked that they keep in mind the location of the equipment as well as how the water is caught to address any noise mitigation for neighbors. He pointed out that they would need to be cognizant of the LRV of the material behind the water spilling over.

Joe Reese asked what process he could go through to try and mitigate the look of the large water tank to the west of his property.

Mr. Vasquez indicated it was an EPCOR water tank.

Mr. Mood remarked that if EPCOR ever decided to make improvements or upgrades, they would have to go through the hillside process. He clarified until that point the conditions are existing and they could not force EPCOR to make any improvements.

Bing Hu commented that if the owner can screen the water tank it would be good for the community.

Chairperson Jarson stated that they would welcome a cooperative effort to screen the tank.

Ted Hofstede inquired if the tank was functional.

Member Covington replied that it was currently functioning.

Steve Schaffner remarked that he was concerned about water flow and particularly water that flowed east of the property toward 57th Street since a curb that was put in to help protect his property from flooding has recently been destroyed by construction on a neighboring property. He inquired if they could blast into areas of the mountain rather than working with drill pipes to reduce the amount of time neighbors were listening to construction.

Myra Schaffner noted that when new homes are built the tendency is for water to shoot onto the road below. She noted that catching the water was important since those roads can turn into rivers with heavy rainfall.

Member Wastchak pointed out that one of the benefits of developing the lot was the addition of onsite retention.

Mr. Prodanov reiterated that their intent would be to make things better for any downstream properties.

Ryan Woody commented that he was concerned about water. He noted he was specifically concerned about the trough at the end of the driveway since water running down Glen and 57th flowed directly into the driveway of a property he manages.

No Action[20-211](#)

Formal review for a new single family residence at 5939 E Quartz Mountain Road (APN 169-48-005A).

Mr. Vasquez gave an overview of the application. This application would construct a new residence on a property that already had an existing guest house. The application had been submitted on December 5, 2019. This was the final formal application. The owner also owned the property adjacent to the east. The new house would be 6,000 square feet and would have a net disturbance of 27% and they were allowed a total disturbance of 28%.

Ram Gangadean, the applicant, stated he had met with the Committee for the concept submittal three months prior. He had owned both properties for about 25 years. He wanted the house to create very minimal impact on the neighbors. He was willing to answer any questions the Committee had. He was going to use clay tiles on the roof. There would be very minimal amount of flat roof. There would be a plaster system on the walls. The house would be made of steel concrete core blocks. The windows would be a western window system with dark bronze frames. The plan was to have a contemporary Santa Barbara look to the house with columns. The house would be Barnwood Gray in color.

Mr. Jarson asked what materials would be used for the flat parts of the roof.

Mr. Gangadean replied he would be open to whatever the Committee would like for the flat parts of the roof.

Mr. Jarson stated he could use an approved foam coat and used a rock chip roof.

Mr. Covington asked what the elevation difference between the existing house and the proposed house. He wanted to know how much livable square footage there would be for the houses combined.

Mr. Gangadean replied the new house would be 16 feet above the existing house, because he did not want to make a big cut. There would be about 7,500 square feet of area for the houses combined.

Mr. Wastchak asked how big the guest house would be with the changes being made.

Mr. Gangadean replied the guest house would have 2,580 square feet.

Mr. Tonn asked where the 3,300 feet of restored area was located.

Mr. Gangadean replied the restored area would be between the two houses. They would be planting native plants between the two houses.

Mr. Wastchak asked if someone had been living in the current guest house.

Mr. Gangadean stated he had renters for the current guest house.

Mr. Tonn was confused where the 3,300 feet of restored area was coming from. It did not make sense to him when looking at the aerial view. The 3,300 feet was needed in order to construct the house.

Mr. Gangadean commented the civil engineer who came up with this calculation was not in the meeting.

Mr. Wastchak asked if staff had looked at these calculations.

Mr. Vaquez replied staff did look at the calculations.

Mr. Gangadean talked to his civil engineer and it was credits versus disturbed area.

Mr. Covington asked what the materials were for the driveway.

Mr. Gangadean replied the driveway was going to be made of paved stone.

Mr. Jarson looked at the landscape plan and did not have any objections to plants that were going to be planted. The outdoor lighting was recessed well.

Mr. Gangadean stated any up lights they had were highlighting plants.

Mr. Jarson asked if there were any comments on this application.

Ms. Micuda stated she was not opposed to the property. She was concerned because the driveway was almost on the property line. There were windows that would reflect headlights and she wanted reassurance that there would not be lights reflecting and hitting her own home. She thought their view would be obstructed by the house and by the plants. She just wanted to address these issues now.

Mr. Gangadean replied he was compliant with code and anytime a property was developed, views would be obstructed.

Ms. Micuda wanted to walk the property and know how much of the view would be obstructed.

Mr. Jarson asked what plants would be next to the driveway.

Mr. Gangadean replied there would be some Palo Verde trees next to the driveway.

Ms. Micuda thought it was not very neighborly how Mr. Gangadean was acting. She wanted to come up with a simple solution.

Mr. Jarson asked if Mr. Gangadean was willing to plant some plants to screen headlights.

Mr. Gangadean replied he would be okay with that.

Ms. Micuda commented she wanted plants to screen, but not get too high to block her view.

Mr. Hu asked if he considered putting the driveway coming from Hummingbird Dr.

Mr. Gangadean replied that would ruin the design of the house.

Mr. Jarson stated they could create screening stipulations.

Mr. Anton commented they could never guarantee views.

Mr. Gangadean stated he would do what he could to mitigate Ms. Micuda's issues.

Mr. Jarson thought the solution to this would be adding screening plants.

A motion was made by Committee Member Tonn, seconded by Chair Jarson, to approve the Formal review for a new single family residence at 5939 E Quartz Mountain Road (APN 169-48-005A) subject to stipulations. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Jarson, Tonn, Covington, Anton and Wastchak

[20-212](#)

Formal review for a new single family residence at 5820 E Glen Drive (APN 169-55-933).

Mr. Vasquez gave an overview of the application. This was an application for a new two-story single-family residence that would be approximately 7,200 square feet of livable area. The application was submitted on May 9, 2018. They were proposing a negative edge pool at the front. They had a disturbance allowance of 9.3% and they were proposing a disturbance of 9.3%. They were providing retention onsite. There were some draining easements on the property.

Bing Hu, the applicant, stated he was very mindful of the drainage concerns. All colors would blend well into Hillside. They already engaged a grading contractor. It would take approximately six to eight weeks to complete the grading.

Rock safety was taken into consideration.

Mr. Jarson liked the color palette. He asked if the roof would be granular or rock chip. He saw there were glass guard rails and wondered of their reflectivity.

Mr. Hu stated they were willing to do granular or rock chip. The guard rails would be coated so they did not reflect.

Mr. Jarson asked if they had considered solar.

Mr. Hu replied he had not considered solar, but if they were to consider solar, it would not be seen by the neighbors.

Mr. Jarson was concerned seeing an evergreen listed in the landscape.

Mr. Hu stated there were no evergreens and it was just leftover on the legend.

Mr. Covington wondered if the rocks slid easily.

Mr. Hu stated the rocks were being put in safely and would not slide easily. Mr. Jarson was concerned with some of the lighting.

Mr. Hu stated some lights were needed, as the clients were older and needed the safety.

Mr. Jarson asked if they stipulated there could only be eight lights rather than ten.

Mr. Hu stated that would be okay. They could get rid of some of the lighting, but they had to keep enough that it was safe for the clients to be able to see and get around.

Mr. Wastchak asked how recessed the lighting was.

Mr. Hu stated the lighting was recessed.

Mr. Jarson asked if anyone wanted to make a comment.

Ms. Schaffner stated her main concern was the water runoff that could cause flooding. Anything they could do to slow down water flow would be appreciated. She asked how much of the mountain would be cut into.

Mr. Hu said it was a priority to make sure water did not flow into neighbors' houses. There would be some retention basins. The deepest part they would cut into would be 20 feet. They would minimize whatever impact they could.

David Sullivan, located at 729 at Arroyo and 57th Place, commented their water flow issue had been mitigated, but any additional water would cause flooding. He appreciated the applicant taking precautions against flooding.

A motion was made by Chair Jarson, seconded by Committee Member Wastchak, to approve the Formal review for a new single family residence at 5820 E Glen Drive (APN 169-55-933) subject to stipulations. The motion carried by the following

vote:

Aye: 5 - Jarson, Tonn, Covington, Anton and Wastchak

4. Staff Reports

Mr. Vasquez stated they now had an updated Hillside brochure. They were working on mailing out these brochures. There were updates to the website such as Hillside map applications that would be updated regularly.

5. Committee Reports

Chair Jarson announced the next two meeting dates would be Wednesday, June 10, 2020 at 8:00 a.m. and Wednesday, July 8, 2020 at 8 a.m.

Mr. Wastchak mentioned he could not attend the June 10, 2020 meeting

Mr. Tonn asked if they were to just send Mr. Vasquez any direct inquiries from citizens about their lot.

Mr. Vasquez replied that was correct. He wanted them to forward them to him.

6. Next Meeting Date

Chairperson Jarson announced that the next two meetings would take place on Wednesday, June 10, 2020 and Wednesday, July 8, 2020.

Member Wastchak commented that he will not be able to attend their next meeting.

Member Tonn inquired if there was protocol, they should follow when they get direct emails from residence about things happening on hillside properties that the resident wants investigated.

Mr. Vasquez replied that he would forward the email to himself and provide the resident with his contact information.

7. Adjournment

A motion was made by Chairperson Jarson, seconded by Committee Member Covington, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Jarson, Tonn, Covington, Anton and Wastchak