



# Town of Paradise Valley

6401 E Lincoln Dr  
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

## Minutes – Final

### Hillside Building Committee

---

Wednesday, September 9, 2020

8:00 AM

Town Hall Boardroom

---

#### Committee Members

##### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jarson called the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

**Present 5 –** Chair Scott Jarson  
Member Scott Tonn  
Member John Wainwright  
Member Daran Wastchak  
Member Pamela Georgelos

#### **STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

Community Development Director Lisa Collins  
Planning Manager Paul Michaud  
Town Engineer Paul Mood  
Hillside Development Administrator Hugo Vasquez  
Hillside Development Planner Jose Mendez

##### 2. EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### 3. APPLICATION REVIEW

**A. 20-352      Re-approval review for a new single-family residence at 4606 E Charles Drive (APN 168-69-022).**

Mr. Vasquez provided an overview of the item. He explained that the property was previously demolished, and the proposal included a 2,600 sq ft residence with an attached carport and a pool with a water feature. The project was approved in February 2019, but the previous owner failed to obtain a building permit, causing the application to expire. Plans presented today mirror what was submitted in 2019, however, the applicant voiced his intent to come back for a review to after making changes to the application. The proposed project will have minimal impact on vegetation and lighting.

Applicant and owner Jeremiah Burke stated that he had taken responsibility for the undone project and stipulations of the previous approval, such as obtaining general liability insurance and Hillside assurance.

Chair Jarson asked Ms. Lamoreaux about the anticipated changes for the proposed project. Ms. Lamoreaux stated that Mr. Burke wanted to remove the water feature and use native

vegetation instead. Most of the changes were internal, with the only visible changes being a bigger window in the office and an additional window in a bedroom. The man cave in the garage would become a livable space with a narrower roll-up garage door to fit in a pool bath. Solar was not anticipated for the application.

Chair Jarson asked about the roof treatment on the flat portions and suggested a granular topcoat or more natural material. He questioned if something was previously approved.

Mr. Burke shared that the materials presented today were previously submitted in 2019, and the foam roof would be coated with a brown color. He agreed to pursue granular coating.

Chair Jarson addressed the landscape plan which included deer grass. He asked about revegetation plans on the irregular desert areas. Chair Jarson suggested rotating the house.

Ms. Lamoreaux explained that if the home was moved, the big tree in the neighboring property would be visible and would ruin the view corridor from the master bedroom.

The Committee discussed the material board and the travertine. The applicant was cautioned of the potential color inconsistency.

Member Tonn asked for clarification on the water feature.

Mr. Burke confirmed that it would be removed and replaced with a negative edge pool and plants from the approved list.

The Committee also discussed the requirement for a ribbon curb and the height of the building. At the request of Member Wastchak, Mr. Vasquez explained that the shaded section displayed in the plans represented the cross-section through the building, and it met the height requirements.

Ms. Lamoreaux provided additional clarification, explaining that the highest corner of the roof was 23 feet 6 inches above the natural grade.

Member Georgelos asked about the drainage plan and building lighting.

Mr. Vasquez explained that drainage didn't affect adjacent owners and was consistent with historical flows. In relation to lighting he clarified that an error had been made in the report, but it would be stipulated that all building lighting not exceed 750 lumens and additional light sources should be removed as necessary.

Mr. Burke stated that construction would begin as soon as a building permit was issued.

Member Georgelos raised concerns about the disturbed areas on the site after the original structure was demolished. She suggested that the site be buttoned up more and revegetated.

Mr. Vasquez explained that the existing non-conforming condition of the site could be reduced but not made worse.

Chair Jarson agreed and suggested that all disturbed areas be revegetated and top-coated with natural material to be approved by staff and Chair.

Mr. Burke agreed and stated that the restoration would add to the overall aesthetic of the neighborhood.

The Committee agreed to include a stipulation that called for a revegetation plan to be submitted.

No public comment was provided.

**A motion was made by Chair Jarson, seconded by Member Wastchak, to approve the application with stipulations 1 to 12, and adding three stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 – Chair Jarson, Member Tonn, Member Wastchak, Member Georgelos, Member Wainwright

**B. 20-353 Combined review for a remodel, deck, and patio expansion, and landscape improvements at 7819 N Mohave Road (APN 169-03-058).**

Mr. Vasquez provided an overview of the item. He explained that the project was a minor interior remodel with no new disturbances proposed, except for the 244 sq ft infill. The landscaping plan included new revegetation, while the existing non legally conforming structure would be removed. New light fixtures for the wall sconces would be retrofitted to meet the lighting requirements. New landscaping lighting, water feature, fire feature, and barbecue were also proposed. The entry gate met the 40 ft requirement. The Committee approved the minor action items, including the use of lighter materials.

Bryan and Elizabeth Saba, the applicants, introduced themselves.

Braden Santarcangelo, the architect for the project, stated that the project aimed to open the north side of the building to provide better views by creating more doors and windows. The plan included an interior and exterior remodel, new steel and aluminum-clad wood windows, newly enhanced plantings, and limestone cladding on the front entry. The project proposed expanding the rear patio to include a fireplace, fire pit area, and barbecue. The silver travertine material will be used in the pool area and front entryway.

The Committee discussed an enhancer for the limestone material and the non-native plantings proposed. Concerns were expressed about the durability of the material over time.

Chair Jarson raised concern over the non-native plants but saw no issue. He asked about the stone veneer on the entry gates and wondered what material was intended to be used.

Mr. Santarcangelo explained that they planned to use an indigenous stone from the property to integrate the gate into the existing landscape, but they were open to suggestions.

Chair Jarson preferred the use of natural materials. He also discussed the lighting for the barbecue and the uplighting, which was used for safety purposes and explained that the lights were placed strategically to create a glow of the natural cut.

Chair Jarson asked about some up lights labeled 20, 25, 26, and 28, which were illuminating the trees.

Mr. Santarcangelo believed that the lights were placed appropriately and did not need to be adjusted.

Member Tonn expressed concern about accepting material over the Light Reflection Value (LRV) limits and suggested that the Committee should record and clarify their intent to approve materials that comply with the code.

Mr. Santarcangelo explained that the materials over the Light Reflection Value (LRV) allowed were accents and provided natural material with an enhancer to deepen the color.

Member Tonn suggested having a Light Reflection Value (LRV) reading on the revised material color once the sealer is put on it.

Member Georgelos suggested supplementing the material board to record what Mr. Santarcangelo proposed in terms of the wash on the limestone and to investigate alternatives to avoid the natural state of the stone from being affected by the beating sun.

Chair Jarson suggested stipulating that all the limestone accents be enhanced to reduce the Light Reflection Value (LRV) and for the material board to be updated once it's done.

Mr. Santarcangelo agreed to provide an updated material board to Mr. Vasquez that afternoon indicating the augmented stone.

Chair Jarson expressed concern about the precast concrete and asked if there were any other concerns from staff.

Mr. Michaud and Mr. Vasquez stated that they had no concerns with the project.

Chair Jarson opened the public comment.

Jeff Scoon, a resident, supported the project and believed the applicants would make a great addition to the community.

Bill Cleverly, a resident, congratulated the applicants on their improvements and asked about the maximum Light Reflection Value (LRV) allowed and the type of exterior light fixtures that were code compliant.

Mr. Vasquez explained that the maximum Light Reflection Value (LRV) allowed was 38% and that exterior light fixtures were supposed to be downward only and dark sky compliant, with a maximum of 750 lumens.

Mr. Cleverly noted that the proposed light fixtures were tasteful and expressed satisfaction with the applicant's communication with Mr. Hinckley.

**A motion was made by Chair Jarson, seconded by Member Tonn, to approve the application with stipulations 1 to 10, and adding three stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 – Chair Jarson, Member Tonn, Member Wastchak, Member Georgelos, Member Wainwright

**C. 20-354      Formal Review for a new single-family residence at 6019 E Foothill Drive North (APN 169-03-056).**

Mr. Vasquez provided an overview of the item. The project had originally been submitted in December 2017 while 2014 Hillside Development Regulations were in place. This project included the construction of a new 9,000 sq ft home with a pool. The applicant had proposed some minor landscape lighting and a continuous light source for building lighting that did not specifically comply with the code.

Darren Petrucci, an architect representing the applicant, presented the design concept, which featured a continuous ribbon-like house with VM zinc siding and a garage with a sliding door panel. The project included solar panels and the roof would be ballasted in flat portions.

Mr. Vasquez asked if the solar panels would be on a separate application.

The Committee discussed the materials used, such as the zinc siding and the sandblasting of blocks. They also talked about the drainage plan and the aesthetics of the rock outlet.

Nick Prodanov, a civil engineer, assured the Committee that he was confident about how the water would be handled and that the site was undisturbed.

The Committee discussed the use of LED lights and how they would function as dim lights for the driveway and the space below.

Mr. Petrucci assured the Committee that the light would not create hotspots on the home and that it would be built with an exterior drywall-dense glass lid on the underside.

The Committee expressed a preference for other lighting options which would not create washing of the building. They also discussed the need to protect the undisturbed areas during construction and suggested the use of permanent ropes or chains be put in place to prevent overstepping the boundaries.

The Committee was shown a rock outcropping, and Mr. Petrucci explained that they planned to make it a feature of the house. The contractor would have to provide a construction staging plan to show where their dumpsters and facilities would be placed on the site.

Mr. Mood discussed the importance of ensuring emergency vehicle access on the narrow road during the construction phase.

Mr. Vasquez inquired about the water drainage plan for the rear basin and the use of permeable pavers for the driveway.

Mr. Prodanov assured him that there was a drain and a pipeline running into the basin for water flow. The permeable pavers would not be used for retention, but they would help reduce runoff.

Member Wastchak emphasized the importance of following the manufacturer's specifications for the permeable pavers and providing documentation for the correct product installed during the final inspection.

Chair Jarson opened the public comment.

Bill Cleverly, a resident, praised Mr. Petrucci's innovative design for the house and asked questions regarding the adjacent lot and house features. He inquired about the color and texture of the roof.

Mr. Petrucci explained that the ballast roof would have pea gravel to integrate into the landscape. They also discussed the skylight, which was a clear story window, and the zinc cladding, which would not become shinier over time.

Mr. Cleverly asked about the lighting for the pool area, which would have a soft ambient glow.

Mr. Petrucci replied that they had not yet selected a builder and anticipated starting construction in about 90 days.

Staff explained that the applicant would not be required to connect to the Town sewer and had a year from that day to get a building permit.

Judy O'Patrony, a resident, thanked Mr. Vasquez for sending plans and complimented Mr. Petrucci's design, which follows the natural watercourse. She expressed concern about drainage and runoff from the east side of the lot, which affects her property, and suggested baffling or riprap to limit erosion.

Mr. Vasquez and Mr. Prodanov discussed the limited disturbance and the need to bring improvements back to the Committee for re-approval. They also discussed the possibility of placing check dams on the property, with a limit of 300 sq ft for additional disturbance, which Mr. Prodanov confirmed was sufficient.

Member Wastchak noted that the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) must be approved and inspected before any construction may begin, including measures such as straw wattles and silt fencing.

The Committee agreed on the suggestion for checking dams.

**A motion was made by Chair Jarson, seconded by Member Wastchak, to approve the application with stipulations as provided in the report and adding three stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 – Chair Jarson, Member Tonn, Member Wastchak, Member Georgelos, Member Wainwright

**D. 20-355      Formal Review for a new single-family residence at 5405 E San Miguel Avenue (APN 172-47-041).**

Mr. Vasquez provided an overview of the item. The proposed project involved constructing a new single-family residence on a lot where the original home had been demolished in 2015. The proposed home would have 7,200 sq ft of livable area and a pool on the north side of the property. The gross disturbed area was at 58% and reduced to 38%. Stormwater would be rerouted around the property and exit at the same natural outfalls with rock to slow down the water. The stormwater would also be retained on-site through a series of pipes and underground tanks. The applicants completed the Safety Improvement Plan (SIP), and there were no public comments received during the 45-day period. It was noted that the applicants would be connected to the existing sewer, and an expansion of the cul-de-sac would not be required.

Agnieszka Jastrzebska, an architect representing the applicant, presented the project to the Committee. She noted that she was aiming to blend it into the Hillside, with only the green roof above the dining room being a new addition.

Chair Jarson requested to look at the material board.

Mr. Vasquez expressed concerns about the concrete sample but later confirmed its compliance.

The Committee discussed the discrepancy in the color of the concrete sample and agreed to eliminate it from the board.

Member Georgelos asked for clarification on the color and texture of the concrete and suggested providing larger samples.

The Committee agreed to document compliance with an average read of three samples.

Ms. Jastrzebska agreed to request additional samples without logos. She also agreed to remove the Tucson Arizona gray sample from the board.

Chair Jarson suggested keeping a sample on the board, despite concerns about its accuracy.

Member Wastchak wanted to subtract the sample, but Member Georgelos thought documenting it was enough.

The Committee discussed concerns about certain grasses becoming invasive and proposed a substitution. They also discussed disturbed areas and revegetation plans.

Mr. Vasquez did not anticipate any drainage or grading issues.

Member Georgelos expressed the need to review the effects of a new structure on historical water routes and neighboring properties.

Ms. Jastrzebska assured the Committee that they had addressed drainage concerns and conducted percolation tests.

Mr. Prodanov explained the original drainage design, including added boulders around the north property line, five flow lines from the mountain, check dams, and riprap. He also confirmed that all water runoff was accounted for and had capacity in the tanks provided.

Ms. Jastrzebska mentioned that the driveway had been moved and was now narrower.

The Committee was satisfied with the discussion on grading and drainage.

Member Georgelos asked about the nature of the 12 wall lights mentioned in Mr. Vasquez' summary.

Mr. Vasquez explained that the walls were against the concrete benches, around the fire feature, and on the upper deck for safety purposes.

Ms. Jastrzebska showed the lighting specification and confirmed that they shone down.

Josh Coon, a resident, asked for clarification on the driveway and boulders near the property line. Mr. Prodanov answered his questions. Mr. Coon also expressed concerns about water drainage and the color contrast of the gray concrete against the Camelback Mountain backdrop.

The Committee reviewed the standard notes on changes, construction, assurance, insurance, parking safety plan, natural stone selection, and landscape as built.

**A motion was made by Member Wastchak, seconded by Member Wainwright, to approve the application with stipulations as provided in the report, and adding one stipulation. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 – Chair Jarson, Member Tonn, Member Wastchak, Member Georgelos, Member Wainwright

Mr. Vasquez provided an overview of the proposal to construct a new single-family resident with a negative edge located on the south side of the lot. The site plan showed that 58% of the property was currently disturbed, but the building path allowed for a maximum of 38% disturbance. Due to existing conditions, the disturbance would be reduced to 39.6%, leaving 17,000 sq ft disturbed area on the site. Water crossing through the property would pass through culverts under the driveway and follow the natural course of the property. The property would remain on a septic system since the Town does not allow a force main. The cul-de-sac would remain the same, but the Town Engineer may require a new curb. There is a utility easement on the north side of the property that must be abandoned prior to receiving a building permit. All utilities will go through the south side of the property.

Christa Petracca, the applicant, discussed the design of the house and the use of natural materials.

Member Wastchak asked for elaboration on the town's position regarding modifications to the driveway and cul-de-sac ending.

Town Engineer Paul Mood checked with the Phoenix Fire Department and confirmed that the current cul-de-sac radius was sufficient for turning around a firetruck. The fire marshal was okay with leaving the current approximate radius of the cul-de-sac and was more concerned with the applicant making street improvements, which would include the addition of a curb. He suggested that the applicant consider increasing the radius of the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Petracca expressed concerns about destabilization if they touched the area to the left of the tree where the wash was located.

Member Wastchak suggested doing thickened-edged type concrete downturn with the curb.

Member Georgelos echoed the need to get the best result possible for proper access to emergency vehicles.

Chair Jarson expressed concerns about the lack of planning for steep spills in the past but acknowledged the need to work with what was there. He also asked if the applicant was considering solar.

Ms. Petracca stated that solar was not requested.

Chair Jarson asked Ms. Petracca about the material for the modified roof with a granular topcoat.

Ms. Petracca confirmed a granular topcoat and explained that it came with a warranty that was not voided by painting it.

Chair Jarson noted that different manufacturers had different specifications for the topcoat, but he approved of Ms. Petracca's choice as long as it met the specifications.

Ms. Petracca also discussed the tile to be used on the patio and driveway.  
Chair Jarson wanted staff to review the choice before final approval.

The Committee discussed the amount of recessed can lights on the structure, and Ms. Petracca explained that they were small and for safety.



The Committee expressed some concern about the amount of lighting, but they felt more comfortable after learning that the lights were small and had a low lumen count. They also discussed the ability to upgrade the lumens later.

Member Tonn expressed concerns about the electrical capacity of the light fixtures and whether they could handle a higher bulb wattage.

Chair Jarson stated that he didn't see anything in the specification that would prohibit a higher-wattage bulb, and Ms. Petracca offered to confirm with the lighting experts.

The Committee discussed the potential pushback from neighbors about the site being rebuilt above the historical grade.

Ms. Vasquez stated that they had been asking for historic diagrams from the civil engineer and that they had the original grades as interpreted by a civil engineer on the signed set of plans.

Mr. Prodanov also assured the Committee that the new roof would not exceed the Town's 24 ft offset from the historical and natural grades and the overall 40 ft height.

Ms. Vasquez mentioned that they were working on a process to have additional checks during construction to alleviate questions that arise throughout the process.

Chair Jarson opened the public comment.

Brenda Bronson, a resident, expressed her concern to Ms. Petracca about the water drainage on her property. She explained that her retaining wall was at risk of collapsing due to the water runoff from her neighbor's property.

Mr. Prodanov confirmed that the drainage in the area was a problem, but their project aimed to mitigate the existing drainage conditions.

Member Wastchak suggested that Ms. Bronson speaks with a civil engineer to resolve the issue.

Chair Jarson mentioned the need to address the can lighting and patio tile for the project.

Member Wastchak suggested that a 350-lumen bulb might be acceptable, while Ms. Petracca asked if there was a way to prevent subsequent owners from putting in a 350-lumen bulb.

Member Tonn suggested capping the number of lumens to limit the total output for the property.

Mr. Vasquez stated that there was no code to restrict the number of lights, but the placement was subject to the Committee's approval.

Member Georgelos suggested reducing the number of lights to make it easier to police and enforce.

Chair Jarson expressed concern that the number of lights on the back patio was excessive and proposed reducing the number of canned lights or limiting the lumen output.

Member Wastchak suggested a stipulation that limits the lumen output to 250 for each light

fixture without locking the applicant into a specific fixture.

**A motion was made by Member Tonn, seconded by Member Wastchak, to approve the application with stipulations 1 to 14, and adding two stipulations. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 – Chair Jarson, Member Tonn, Member Wastchak, Member Georgelos, Member Wainwright

#### **4. STAFF REPORTS**

Mr. Vasquez and Chair Jarson discussed an issue with demolitions on Hillside properties and the concern it raises for neighbors and the community. Currently, the Committee does not have to approve demolitions, but they ask that a gradient drainage plan and retention basins be put in place in case the house is never constructed. However, neighbors still have concerns about excessive work, machinery, and materials being disturbed during demolitions.

Chair Jarson was concerned about the disturbance and increased runoff that demolitions invite and believed there should be greater protection of the site, especially on Hillside properties. They also discussed the issue of how long a property should be grandfathered in as historically disturbed and whether there should be a set process in the code for demolitions on Hillside properties.

Member Wastchak asked if the new hillside requirements for construction staging are required for the demolition portion of the project.

Mr. Vasquez stated that some portions of the plan probably need to be satisfied before the demolition starts, but he is not sure which portions. He added that it would be better to have rules applied across the board.

Chair Jarson suggested that the town consider a limit on grandfathered disturbance for demolition properties.

Member Wastchak raised concerns about unintended consequences, such as old shacks left up because people know they will lose their grandfather status and suggested that they think about time limits.

Member Georgelos stated that there should be some thought around how to decide what happens with demolition of properties and what kind of oversight should be in place.

Mr. Vasquez suggested having a demolition-only application that would get committee approval to ensure that they're not disturbing more than they should.

Member Wastchak recommended that staff look at the requirements for building a hillside project and see what portion of that can be pushed to an earlier place during the demolition. Member Tonn mentioned issues with people grabbing trees during demolition.

Mr. Vasquez suggested that they should provide all the disturbance calculations and certify all that, and they will discuss it with the Committee again to decide if there's minimal committee involvement.

Member Wastchak clarified that when he said, "minimize committee involvement," he meant minimizing in the day-to-day operations.

Member Georgelos agreed that the discussion was valuable and should be continued.

Member Wastchak informed everyone that the next planning commission meeting, on September 15, would be discussing pad heights and encouraged the members of the Committee to attend, as their expertise might be helpful.

## **5. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

## **6. NEXT MEETING DATE**

The next Hillside Building Committee meeting dates were tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, October 14, 2020, at 8:00 AM and Wednesday, November 11, 2020, at 8:00 AM.


## **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion for Adjournment made at 11:56 AM.

**A motion was made by Chair Jarson, seconded by Member Wastchak, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried with the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 – Chair Jarson, Member Tonn, Member Wastchak, Member Georgelos, Member Wainwright

### **Paradise Valley Hillside Building Committee**

By:   
Cherise Fullbright, Secretary  
for Hugo Vasquez