



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-87-D-03-2

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Date of VPC Meeting</b> | April 1, 2025   |
| <b>Request From</b>        | S-1 (Approved CP/BP PCD), S-1 (Approved R-3A PCD), and S-1  |
| <b>Request To</b>          | PUD PCD   |
| <b>Proposal</b>            | Major Amendment to the Paradise Ridge PCD to allow multifamily and single-family attached residential |
| <b>Location</b>            | Northeast corner of 64th Street and Mayo Boulevard  |
| <b>VPC Recommendation</b>  | Approval, per the staff recommendation, with modifications  |
| <b>VPC Vote</b>            | 12-0  |

### VPC DISCUSSION:

*Agenda Item 5 (GPA-DSTV-1-24-2) and Agenda Item 6 (Z-87-D-03-2) are companion cases and were heard concurrently.*

*No members of the public registered to speak on this item.*

### Staff Presentation:

**Adrian Zambrano**, staff, provided an overview of General Plan Amendment Case No. GPA-DSTV-1-24-2, including the location of the request, surrounding land uses and General Plan Land Use Map designations, and the proposed General Plan Land Use Map designation. Mr. Zambrano shared the staff findings and stated that staff recommends approval. Mr. Zambrano then provided an overview of Rezoning Case No. Z-87-D-03-2, including the location of the request and surrounding zoning and land uses. Mr. Zambrano shared background information on the site regarding the Paradise Ridge PCD (Planned Community District) and the Desert Ridge/Kierland Major Employment Center. Mr. Zambrano discussed the proposal, including the land use, development standards, landscape standards, fence and wall standards, lighting standards, and design guidelines, and displayed the site plan and renderings. Mr. Zambrano stated that the request had not received any community correspondence. Mr. Zambrano shared the staff findings and stated that staff recommends approval subject to stipulations. Mr. Zambrano shared the recommended stipulations and the public hearing schedule. Mr. Zambrano displayed modified language for Stipulation No. 8,

noting that staff recently received the updated stipulation language from the Floodplain Management section, and there was not enough time to publish an addendum to the staff report. Mr. Zambrano recommended that if the committee voted to recommend approval on this item, that their recommendation include the modified language for Stipulation No. 8.

### **Applicant Presentation:**

**Nick Wood**, representative with Snell & Wilmer, LLP, introduced himself and the development team, and displayed other projects that the developer has built in Phoenix and Scottsdale. Mr. Wood discussed the surrounding context of the site. Mr. Wood stated that the existing wash on the site appeared small, but it would not be small anymore once Rawhide Wash was built. Mr. Wood stated that the wash corridor would be 90 feet wide. Mr. Wood stated that the Committee had previously asked when this project was last presented to the Committee if the trails along the wash could be extended to the north under the freeway. Mr. Wood stated that they looked into it and found that the culvert under the freeway was not tall enough for trails to pass through. Mr. Wood displayed the existing and proposed General Plan Land Use Map designation and zoning. Mr. Wood displayed and discussed the conceptual site plan and landscape plan, noting that due to the size of the wash, two bridges would need to be constructed. Mr. Wood discussed the improvements of Mayo Boulevard, proposed ingress and egress to and from the site, and the circulation plan. Mr. Wood emphasized that the main entrance to the site would be from 66th Street, noting that this was the reason the main signage would be at that corner. Mr. Wood stated that the site would be split up into four quadrants. Mr. Wood discussed the proposed development standards. Mr. Wood noted that there would be an enhanced corner feature at the corner of 66th Street and Mayo Boulevard, and that there would be a building stepdown along Mayo Boulevard for Parcel D (Phase 5). Mr. Wood shared the renderings, noting the enhanced landscaping, Mayo Boulevard improvements, and that the wash would be preserved in an undisturbed, natural state. Mr. Wood stated that they are in agreeance with the stipulations and would continue working with staff on the sign at the corner of 66th Street and Mayo Boulevard.

### **Questions from Committee:**

**Committee Member Michelle Santoro** asked if there was a reason that the General Plan Amendment included commercial, but the Planned Unit Development (PUD) did not. Committee Member Santoro noted that when this project was last presented to the Committee, a hotel was included, which was removed. **Mr. Wood** responded that the hotel and commercial uses were removed from the PUD since the property at the southeast corner of Mayo Boulevard and 64th Street would have a hotel and commercial uses. Committee Member Santoro stated that the maximum lot coverage requested of 75 percent was much higher than 50 percent lot coverage, which is typical of the R-3 and R-3A zoning districts. Committee Member Santoro asked what the current site plan showed for lot coverage. Mr. Wood responded that it was a conceptual site plan that was likely under 75 percent lot coverage, but 75 percent allowed some flexibility. Committee Member Santoro stated that the proposed development standard for open space was five percent, which is the standard for multifamily residential development. Committee Member Santoro asked what the site plan showed for open

space calculations, noting that more than five percent open space should be codified. Mr. Wood responded that the site plan was over five percent of open space. Committee Member Santoro commended the right-in right-out along 64th Street, noting that it would help to reduce traffic congestion at the 64th Street and Mayo Boulevard intersection. Committee Member Santoro expressed concerns with traffic congestion along Mayo Boulevard as the roadway transitions to one lane west of 64th Street. Committee Member Santoro asked if there was timing for the expansion of Mayo Boulevard west of 64th Street. Mr. Wood responded that they have spent a lot of time with the Street Transportation Department since the beginning of this application, which resulted in three entries into the site to address the traffic volume in the area.

**Committee Member Rick Nowell** expressed concerns with landscaping not being replaced when it dies or is taken out by storms. Committee Member Nowell asked if a stipulation could be added to ensure that the landscaping would be maintained and replaced in accordance with the PUD landscape standards for the life of the project. **Mr. Wood** responded that it would be difficult for staff to enforce this kind of stipulation. Mr. Wood stated that high-end multifamily residential developers do a good job of taking care of their landscaping because of their residents. Committee Member Nowell asked if there would be a bicycle lane along Mayo Boulevard. Mr. Wood responded affirmatively.

**Committee Member Jill Bunnell** asked if there was an existing traffic signal at the intersection of 66th Street and Mayo Boulevard. **Mr. Wood** responded affirmatively.

**Committee Member Gary Kirkilas** asked if the Committee should entertain a motion to add stipulations related to water conservation, or if the applicant would be willing to be committed to doing them. **Mr. Wood** responded that the developer had gave his word to commit to water conservation measures.

**Vice Chair Louis Lagrave** stated that he liked the project. Vice Chair Lagrave echoed concerns with traffic congestion as Mayo Boulevard transitions to one lane west of 64th Street. **Mr. Wood** responded that the hope was that many of the residents would work at the Mayo Clinic Hospital or close by. Mr. Wood stated that the traffic engineers would know much more about the traffic volume and traffic flow. Mr. Wood added that the proposed density was much less than many other multifamily residential projects they have worked on.

**Committee Member Bunnell** recommended that the trails along the wash cross underneath Mayo Boulevard for pedestrians to easily access the south side of Mayo Boulevard, where the Mayo Clinic Hospital is located. Committee Member Bunnell stated that the community needs to be walkable and there should be separation of pedestrians from the major streets whenever possible.

**Chair Steven Bowser** asked when 64th Street to the south would be constructed and who would be responsible for its construction. **Mr. Wood** responded that 64th Street was under construction and the City of Phoenix would be constructing the west half of 64th Street south of Mayo Boulevard. Mr. Wood added that the adjacent developments along the east side of 64th Street, south of Mayo Boulevard, would be constructing the

east half of 64th Street. Mr. Wood clarified that 64th Street would be constructed before this development was fully built out, since it would be constructed in phases. Chair Bowser asked if the City of Phoenix would construct 64th Street to Bell Road. Mr. Wood stated that it would be done in phases, first extending to Reach 11. Chair Bowser asked if the ultimate plan would be to extend 64th Street to Bell Road. Mr. Wood responded affirmatively.

**Committee Member Mark Warren** asked if a culvert was planned to be installed under Mayo Boulevard for the wash. **Mr. Wood** responded affirmatively.

**Public Comments:**

None.

**Applicant Response:**

None.

**MOTION – Z-87-D-03-2:**

**Committee Member Mark Warren** made a motion to recommend approval of Z-87-D-03-2, per the staff recommendation, with modifications to Stipulation No. 8. **Vice Chair Louis Lagrave** seconded the motion.

**VOTE – Z-87-D-03-2:**

**12-0**; the motion to recommend approval of Z-87-D-03-2 per the staff recommendation with modifications passed with Committee Members Barto, Birchby, Bunnell, Carlucci, Israel, Kirkilas, Nowell, Reynolds, Santoro, Warren, Lagrave and Bowser in favor.

**VPC APPROVED STIPULATIONS:**

1. An updated Development Narrative for the 64th & Mayo PUD reflecting the changes approved through this request shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department within 30 days of City Council approval of this request. The updated Development Narrative shall be consistent with the Development Narrative date stamped March 13, 2025, as modified by the following stipulations:
  - a. Front cover: Revise the submittal date information to add the following: City Council adopted: [Add adoption date].
  - b. Page 22, Section F. Signs: Remove all language, except the first two sentences.
2. A minimum 70 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated and constructed for the north half of Mayo Boulevard, per the approved Master Street Plan.
3. A minimum 70 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated and constructed for the east half of 64th Street, per the approved Master Street Plan.

4. A minimum 40 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated and constructed for the west half of 66th Street, per the approved Master Street Plan.
5. Construction, funding, and phasing of all off-site mitigation improvements shall comply with the approved Master Street Plan and Master Phasing Plan for 64th Street and Mayo Boulevard.
6. Replace unused driveways with sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Also, replace any broken or out-of-grade curb, gutter, sidewalk, and curb ramps on all streets and upgrade all off-site improvements to be in compliance with current ADA guidelines
7. All streets within and adjacent to the development shall be constructed with paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, curb ramps, streetlights, median islands, landscaping and other incidentals, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department. All improvements shall comply with all ADA accessibility standards.
8. The site is located within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA), ~~called a~~ **SPECIFICALLY IN** Zone AO, **AS SHOWN** on ~~pPanel~~ 1315L of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), revised ~~ON February 8, 2024~~ **OCTOBER 16, 2013**. **TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE REGULATIONS**, ~~The following requirements shall apply, as approved by the Planning and Development Department~~ **AND THE FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT SECTION OF THE OFFICE OF THE CITY ENGINEER, THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET:**
  - a. The Architect/Engineer is required to ~~show~~ **CLEARLY DELINEATE** the floodplain boundary limits on the Grading and Drainage ~~pPlan~~. **THE PLAN MUST ALSO DEMONSTRATE** and ensure that **POTENTIAL** impacts to the proposed facilities have been **PROPERLY** considered, following **IN ACCORDANCE WITH** the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Regulations (44 CFR Paragraph 60.3) **AND THE**. This includes, but is not limited to, provisions **OUTLINED** in the latest **MOST CURRENT** versions of the Floodplain Ordinance of the Phoenix City Code.
  - b. A copy of the **PRELIMINARY** Grading and Drainage Plan ~~needs to~~ **MUST** be submitted to the Floodplain Management ~~s~~Section of the Office of the City Engineer for review and approval of **TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH FLOODPLAIN-RELATED requirements BEFORE APPLYING FOR GRADING & DRAINAGE AND BUILDING PERMITS. FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT MUST APPROVE THE FINAL GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLANS PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF GRADING & DRAINAGE PERMITS.**

- c. ~~FEMA approved CLOMR-F or CLOMR is required prior to issuance of a Grading and Drainage permit.~~ **PRIOR TO APPLYING FOR GRADING & DRAINAGE AND BUILDING PERMITS, AN ELEVATION CERTIFICATE (FEMA FORM 086-0-33), BASED ON THE CONSTRUCTION PLANS, MUST BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT.**
  - D. **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF VERTICAL CONSTRUCTION, THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE MET:**
    - I. **AN ELEVATION CERTIFICATE, BASED ON THE BUILDING UNDER CONSTRUCTION, MUST BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT.**
    - II. **95% COMPACTION TEST RESULTS FOR THE BUILDING PADS MUST BE PROVIDED.**
  - E. **PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, AN ELEVATION CERTIFICATE BASED ON THE FINISHED CONSTRUCTION, DEMONSTRATING THE STRUCTURE'S COMPLIANCE, MUST BE SUBMITTED TO AND APPROVED BY FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT.**
- 9. The property owner shall record documents that disclose the existence, and operational characteristics of Scottsdale Municipal Airport (SDL) to future owners or tenants of the property. The form and content of such documents shall be according to the templates and instructions provided which have been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney.
  - 10. If determined necessary by the Phoenix Archaeology Office, the applicant shall conduct Phase I data testing and submit an archaeological survey report of the development area for review and approval by the City Archaeologist prior to clearing and grubbing, landscape salvage, and/or grading approval
  - 11. If Phase I data testing is required, and if, upon review of the results from the Phase I data testing, the City Archaeologist, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, determines such data recovery excavations are necessary, the applicant shall conduct Phase II archaeological data recovery excavations
  - 12. In the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction, the developer shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within a 33-foot radius of the discovery, notify the City Archaeologist, and allow time for the Archaeology Office to properly assess the materials.
  - 13. Prior to final site plan approval, the landowner shall execute a Proposition 207 waiver of claims form. The waiver shall be recorded with the Maricopa County Recorder's Office and delivered to the City to be included in the rezoning application file for record.

### **PCD Stipulations**

14. Master Plan documents shall be submitted for portions of the Planned Community District as development occurs, per the applicable development agreement.
15. Right-of-way and improvements shall be determined by the final Traffic Impact Study and a Master Street Plan – Development Agreement between the city, Arizona State Land Department, and the City of Scottsdale. Additional right-of-way and/or easements not specifically identified such as bus bays, turn lanes, landscape/sidewalk easements, slope and construction easements, etc., may be required as determined by the Master Street Plan, or when individual development plans are submitted to the Planning and Development Department for approval.
16. Detailed requirements for potable water, wastewater, and reclaimed water onsite and offsite infrastructure needed to service this project and infrastructure phasing schedules shall be determined at the time of review and approval of the PCD potable water, wastewater, and reclaimed water master plans. Off site infrastructure requirements shall be a function of the amount of major master plan water and sewer lines constructed by other development in the area prior to initiation of this project.

### **STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has no comments.

**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-87-D-03-2**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Date of VPC Meeting</b> | September 10, 2024  |
| <b>Request From</b>        | S-1 (Approved CP/BP PCD), S-1 (Approved R-3A PCD), and S-1  |
| <b>Request To</b>          | PUD PCD   |
| <b>Proposal</b>            | Major Amendment to the Paradise Ridge PCD to allow multifamily and single-family attached residential |
| <b>Location</b>            | Northeast corner of 64th Street and Mayo Boulevard  |

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

*Item No. 3 (GPA-DSTV-1-24-2) and Item No. 4 (Z-87-D-03-2) are companion cases and were heard together.*

*No members of the public registered to speak on this item.*

**APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

**Nick Wood**, representing the applicant with Snell & Wilmer, LLP, provided a presentation describing previous projects by the developer, the surrounding context of the proposed site, the proposed development, and the details of the proposed PUD.

**QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE**

**Committee Member Bunnell** asked about trail connections with the wash on site. **Mr. Wood** stated that more information could be provided about the culvert under the freeway at the next meeting.

**Committee Member Kirkilas** asked about maintaining the wash in a natural state. **Mr. Wood** stated the channelized wash would be in a natural state.

**Committee Member Santoro** asked if the 90-foot height limit is proposed for the entire site. **Mr. Wood** noted that the height limit allows flexibility in the future, although nothing shown on their current plans is that tall. **Ms. Santoro** asked about issues caused by narrower right-of-way on Mayo Boulevard west of 64th Street. **Mr. Wood** provided a description of the proposed condition and noted that the Street Transportation Department will require certain improvements to handle the traffic as new development



is added to the area. **Dawn Cartier** with CivTech provided additional context to demonstrate that this development will not create traffic congestion.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** asked if there is a traffic signal at 66th Street. **Mr. Wood** replied that there is, and it would remain.

**Committee Member Carlucci** asked how many units would need to be added to start to create a traffic problem. **Ms. Cartier** replied that the analysis is done based on the proposal. **Mr. Carlucci** asked if the 1,200-unit limit was to avoid traffic impacts. **Ms. Cartier** replied that the site could probably handle more units.

**Committee Member Kirkilas** asked about the trails shown on the map and any setbacks from the trails. **Mr. Wood** clarified that the adjacent trails are not part of Reach 11 but link to it to the south. **Noel Griemsmann** with Snell & Wilmer, LLC noted that the trails would be 10-foot-wide paths along the sidewalk.

**Committee Member Younger** asked if there was consideration for reducing the height because of the neighbors across the street. **Mr. Griemsmann** described the height step down requirements proposed in the PUD. **Mr. Wood** stated that the distance from the nearest house is about a football field in length and that the height may not be 90 feet depending on the final design.

**Committee Member Nowell** asked about the material for the trails. **Kevin Ransil** with JLB Partners stated that the trails would be compacted gravel.

**Committee Member Carlucci** asked for the rationale for limiting the development to 1,200 units and if it's a missed opportunity. **Mr. Ransil** stated that the density is based on the R-3A density and meets the needs of the developer.

**Committee Member Nowell** asked about the height represented in the renderings. **Mr. Wood** replied that it was 70 feet.

**Committee Member Kollar** asked about the review of the TIA (Traffic Impact Analysis) by the Street Transportation Department. **Mr. Wood** stated that the City bases their stipulations on the review of the TIA.

**Committee Member Bunnell** asked about parking, citing parking issues at a nearby development in Scottsdale. **Mr. Wood** provided a description of parking provided for each proposed building.

**Committee Member Younger** asked about charging stations. **Mr. Wood** replied that they would be provided.

**Chair Bowser** asked about the future connection on 64th Street to Bell Road. **Mr. Wood** replied that it was included in the Mayo Clinic development agreement. **Chair Bowser** stated that there could be opportunities with the water reclamation plant.

**Committee Member Kirkilas** stated a concern about light pollution and suggested full cutoff light fixtures.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

Staff has no comments.