

# Paradise Valley

VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

GPA-PV-1-25-2

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	November 3, 2025
<b>Request From</b>	Industrial
<b>Request To</b>	Residential 15+ dwelling units per acre
<b>Proposal</b>	Multifamily residential and commercial uses
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 660 feet west of the southwest corner of Scottsdale Road and Bell Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval, per the staff recommendation
<b>VPC Vote</b>	9-3

### VPC DISCUSSION:

*Item No. 3 (GPA-PV-1-25-2) and Item No. 4 (Z-41-25-2) are companion cases and were heard together.*

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

### Staff Presentation

**Matteo Moric**, staff, introduced the General Plan Amendment and companion Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning case. Mr. Moric stated these cases would be heard together. Mr. Moric shared a map identifying the location and size of the subject site and provided background and contextual information about the requests.

Mr. Moric noted that although the site is less than 10 acres in size, the exception regarding any residential request in a designated industrial or commerce park area is triggered, thus a minor General Plan Amendment is required. Mr. Moric stated the findings and the staff recommendation of approval for the General Plan Amendment request.

Mr. Moric then presented the zone change request and shared a map of the surrounding zoning, identified the proposed development standards, the site plan, building elevations and summarized the design guidelines. Mr. Moric also stated staff received four letters of opposition regarding the proposal and noted the community concerns. Mr. Moric summarized the staff findings and stated staff recommended approval subject to stipulations. Mr. Moric then summed up the recommended stipulations and the next steps for the proposal.

### **Applicant Presentation**

**Nick Wood**, with Snell & Wilmer LLP, reminded the Committee that he presented this case previously for information only. Mr. Wood stated the site is just west of the intersection of Scottsdale Road and Bell Road. Mr. Wood said immediately east of the site was a CVS Pharmacy and at the corner of Bell Road and Scottsdale Road was a previously approved PUD. Mr. Wood explained there was a mini-storage warehouse site directly west of the subject site and next to that was a single-family residential subdivision. Mr. Wood noted some additional context that hotels were located south of the subject site, and further south was the Kierland area and east is the City of Scottsdale.

Mr. Wood said one of the questions which was raised at the previous meeting was regarding 71st Street and he reminded the Committee that it is a private drive shared by all the property owners that are adjacent to it and Mr. Wood emphasized it is not a city street. Mr. Wood said all the traffic from the proposal moves off 71st Street and explained the movement and median breaks in the area. Mr. Wood said the only reason people would travel south on 71st Street is if they are going to the gas station or traveling south down Scottsdale Road. Mr. Wood said the site was never built as industrial but that is what the General Plan is showing it designated as, so they are now requesting a General Plan Amendment from Industrial to Residential 15+ dwelling units per acre and a rezone from C-2 to PUD. Mr. Wood stated the conceptual site plan proposes 315 dwelling units. Mr. Wood explained he loved the site plan and building elevations as most recent developments seem to be boxes and this has lots of movement and articulation to create visual interest in the architecture which will create a special place. Mr. Wood said it would have a wrap parking structure, where the units wrap around the structure and there would be parking on each floor. Mr. Wood indicated he lives in Optima Camelback in the Old Town Scottsdale area, where the car parking is underground and everything must come up and down such as groceries. Mr. Wood said the building utilizes a step-down approach for the height to reduce as it moves west closer to the single-family residences.

Mr. Wood shared information related to nearby sites such as the Manor Scottsdale at 13220 North Scottsdale Road, which was the old L.A. Fitness site where they proposed a four- and five-story development next to single family residences. Mr. Wood explained that they initially had lots of opposition but had worked with neighbors to ensure they were satisfied as they had no opposition at the hearing.

Mr. Wood showed another site which was the Kierland II Office Building at 16260 North 71st Street which was 56 feet tall from the single-family residential property lines 160 feet away, and 70 feet tall, 220 feet away from the single-family residences.

Mr. Wood explained the proposal is lushly landscaped, with landscaping between the curb and sidewalk, and between the sidewalk and the building. Mr. Wood said

everything has visual interest on the site plan and nothing is the same. Mr. Wood added they are proposing balconies which are inverted and exterior oriented.

Mr. Wood then showed several conceptual renderings. Mr. Wood said the current C-2 zoning allowed approximately 325 more uses than the proposed multifamily residences. Mr. Wood also shared a table breaking out the trips generated from the existing C-2 zoning to the proposed PUD zoning. Mr. Wood summed up that the proposal would have far less traffic than the existing zoning allowed. Mr. Wood said the good news is traffic can't get to the single-family residences to the west so there would be no cut-through traffic there.

Mr. Wood asked not to have the staff recommended signage stipulations and to delete those.

Mr. Wood said they worked very closely with the neighborhood to the west. Mr. Wood showed a community outreach map which identified where support came from. Mr. Wood said they received 170 letters in support, 120 statements of support (verbal) and 127 neutral statements. Mr. Wood then shared a map showing which properties had previously opposed the project but were actively collaborating towards screening solutions, and those previously opposed and non-responsive.

### **Questions from Committee**

**Robert Goodhue** asked why did the applicant not want to comply with the City of Phoenix Sign Ordinance. **Mr. Wood** said there were two ways to have signs approved with one being through the PUD rezone process and the other was to go through a Comprehensive Sign Package application. Mr. Wood said it will take a lot of extra time and would typically get approved unless they do something new and stupid. Mr. Goodhue said normally developers go through the Comprehensive Sign process.

**Diane Peterson** had concerns with the sewer and traffic. Ms. Peterson was concerned with the cumulative effect of building after building, "Optima after Optima". Ms. Peterson expressed concern with traffic going south on Scottsdale Road and said those who live just south believed traffic is a nightmare. Ms. Peterson shared concerns about the sewer work and capacity. Mr. Wood replied that the project's civil engineer worked with the City Water Services Division and there was enough sewer capacity. Ms. Peterson added there are few egresses that go through Scottsdale Road and may not go through the neighborhood on the west but would travel through other neighborhoods. **Mr. Wood** said this project is so far north and near the freeway.

**Larisa Balderrama** asked about the height of the proposed building at the corner of Scottsdale Road and Bell Road and asked if it would be constructed. Mr. Wood noted it was going to be 12 stories and that it would be built. Ms. Balderrama asked questions about traffic movement and thought there may be some challenges to turn. **Mr. Wood** stated there was not enough traffic to warrant a traffic signal.

**Roy Wise** noted he often travels north on Scottsdale Road and thinks traffic will back up on Scottsdale Road and is concerned that to turn left on Bell Road will be impossible. Mr. Wise thought turning right on Bell Road and traveling to the left turn lane to turn left on Scottsdale Road will be a challenge. **Marina Stender**, the applicant's traffic engineer for the project, explained how trips will be generated from the proposal. Ms. Stender stated the project would not warrant a traffic signal, otherwise, a traffic signal study would have to be requested.

**Ms. Peterson** asked if the cumulative effect of all the buildings around the project were taken into consideration. **Ms. Stender** said as traffic engineers they are required to analyze all existing developments and approved development and layer their trips on top of it to see how it affects the roadway network and the capacity of the roadway. Ms. Stender noted that the project did not trigger a full traffic study for the City of Phoenix. Ms. Stender said the existing right and left turn lane on Bell Road was already built longer than the minimum required.

**Anna Sepic** asked for clarity regarding the traffic analysis and if it included the potential C-2 uses which did not exist. **Ms. Stender** said they did the analysis on both current and potential C-2 uses.

**Patrice Marcolla** asked about the traffic study and wondered why it did not trigger a traffic impact analysis. **Ms. Stender** said a full traffic impact analysis is not required.

**Vice Chair Amber Sommer** asked if the lot at the corner of Scottsdale Road and Bell Road was taken into account for the traffic study. **Ms. Sepic** stated that 251 units are to come in at the corner. **Ms. Stender** said with that proposed project they would need to do their own traffic study. Ms. Stender said currently that corner property is empty and not generating any existing trips.

**Robert Gubser** asked if they recall if the project at Scottsdale Road and Bell Road will use 71st Street as its main access. **Mr. Wood** said that 71st Street would be that project's secondary access and there would be two access points.

**Ms. Sepic** asked about the proposed zoning and if they were asking for a C-2 or PUD and asked what the density is. **Mr. Wood** said the density is 73 dwelling units per acre with 315 units.

**Ms. Marcolla** said the ITE traffic study does not seem specific to this site. Ms. **Stender** said the ITE is the bible for traffic studies and there are different categories for studies. Ms. Marcolla said this is specific for the ITE on all streets incoming and outgoing.

**Mr. Wood** said that the Street Transportation Department said before a site plan is approved it would require a full Traffic Impact Study. Mr. Wood said they followed the Street Transportation Department's instruction.

**Ms. Peterson** asked if before site approval they will need to do a full traffic study. **Mr. Wood** said yes.

**Mr. Goodhue** explained the applicant is going through a rezoning to approve the use and once the use is approved their next step is to go through the site planning approval process. Mr. Goodhue said the site plan comes after it is at the City Council level. Mr. Goodhue stated in this case when looking at trip generation, the project will still need to go through the TIA before site plan approval. **Mr. Wood** said after and if the proposal gets Council approval, the applicant will need to get preliminary and final site plan approval.

**Ms. Marcolla** wanted to know if there was an initial or historic traffic study for the site. **Mr. Wood** was not certain but said the study would have been many years ago for a two-story shopping center.

**Kate Bauer** said 1,300 residential units were being built near Mayo on the south side of the 101 and provided information that there currently was 10.5% vacancy rate. Ms. Bauer noted a lot of new apartments were coming and if the applicant saw a lot of demand. **Mr. Wood** said he was not certain about the marketing, but his client was planning to spend \$80 to 90 million on which the lender would need to feel comfortable.

**Justin Westfall**, with Fifield Companies, said there were many units delivered across the north Scottsdale and Phoenix market and there is a tremendous amount of job growth occurring in the area. Mr. Westfall stated these include medical jobs, new headquarters, Taiwanese Semiconductor Manufacturing (TSMC) associated jobs and with the combination of the projected job growth along with the housing shortage there is a high demand for housing.

**Ms. Peterson** said her thought of the village concept is to have people live and work in each village. Ms. Peterson was concerned these units would not be affordable and this is an issue. Ms. Peterson added there is a shortage of housing for people who cannot afford to live at the Optima's such as teachers and fire fighters. **Mr. Westfall** said they would provide a range from studios to three-bedroom units and most of the units would be studios and one bedroom. Mr. Westfall said there would be a variety of housing options and would not be as expensive as Optima projects. Ms. Peterson also asked about units for families who need more than one bedroom. Mr. Westfall said there were also two- and three-bedroom units. Mr. Westfall said there would be different price points depending on where the units are located in the building.

**Mr. Goodhue** said when the Mayo Hospital was coming into the City of Phoenix, City staff had worked with developers in that area and there was astronomical growth and this project could help accommodate people living close to their place of employment. **Mr. Wood** said he recently worked on a rezoning case of 240 acres in the Paradise Ridge area and it anticipates 5 to 6 million square feet of additional job generation and said some construction started but it probably will be a 20-year build out. Mr. Wood

added that investors and lenders will need to be satisfied the project will work, otherwise it would not be built.

**Ms. Baldarrama** asked if the units will be allowed to be used for short-term rentals. **Mr. Westfall** noted that for most rentals of their properties are for a minimum of 12 to 18 months. Mr. Westfall said there is not usually a sublease situation where people can rent the units as Airbnb's.

**Ms. Baldarrama** was concerned with housing shortages due to these short-term rentals. **Mr. Wood** stated his developer clients do not usually allow Airbnb's as they are usually disruptive for other resident tenants.

**Vice Chair Sommer** noted the previous concern of privacy at the information meeting and was wondering what they'd do to accommodate the west side residential neighbors. **Mr. Wood** said they had reached an agreement with a few of the neighbors to raise walls and install trees to alleviate concerns with privacy.

**Mr. Gubser** asked about pedestrian accessibility and if there was access on 71st Street. **Mr. Wood** said there were sidewalks along 71st Street and there was a detached sidewalk along Bell Road.

**Mr. Gubser** questioned if there was a pull-out for rideshares on 71st Street as he was concerned about cars stacking. **Mr. Westfall** noted there was a porte-cochere where rideshares could be pulled onto the site for drop-offs.

### **Public Comments**

None.

### **Applicant Response**

None.

### **Floor/Public Discussion Closed: Motion, Discussion, and Vote.**

**Committee Member Robert Gubser** made a motion to recommend approval of GPA-PV-1-25-2. **Committee Member Robert Goodhue** seconded the motion.

### **VOTE:**

**9-3**; motion to approve GPA-PV-1-25-2 passes with Committee members Franks, Goodhue, Gubser, Hamra, Marcolla, Schmidt, Sepic, Wise and Sommer in favor; Committee members Baldarrama, Bauer, and Peterson in opposition.



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### GPA-PV-1-25-2 INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	October 6, 2025
<b>Request From</b>	Industrial
<b>Request To</b>	Residential 15+ dwelling units per acre
<b>Proposal</b>	Multifamily residential and commercial uses
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 660 feet west of the southwest corner of Scottsdale Road and Bell Road

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

*Item No. 3 (GPA-PV-1-25-2) and Item No. 4 (Z-41-25-2) are companion cases and were heard together.*

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

#### **Staff Presentation**

**Matteo Moric**, staff, introduced the General Plan Amendment and Planned Unit Development (PUD) Rezoning cases and noted they were for informational purposes only at this time. Mr. Moric then introduced the applicant and representative.

#### **Applicant Presentation**

**Nick Wood**, with Snell & Wilmer LLP, provided the context of the area surrounding the proposal. Mr. Wood reminded the Committee he had been in front of them several years prior for a case at the corner of Bell Road and Scottsdale Road. Mr. Wood said it was for a high-rise apartment project that will break ground in 2026 with heights of up to 156 feet. Mr. Wood noted next to the subject site on the east is a CVS Pharmacy, to the west is single-family subdivision, and ministorage and hotels are located to the south. Mr. Wood added that further south is the Kierland area and to the east is the City of Scottsdale.

Mr. Wood stated the subject site is currently zoned C-2 and they are proposing to rezone to a PUD. Mr. Wood added the general plan designates the site as Industrial. Mr. Wood showed the conceptual site plan which shows the proposed buildings facing Bell Road and 71st Street. Mr. Wood indicated 71st Street is a private street which has an easement to Bell Road. Mr. Wood explained how the project has its residential units

wrap around the parking structure and noted the parking structure is as tall as the rest of the building.

Mr. Wood stated they had been working with the neighboring residents to the west. Mr. Wood added the conceptual plan shows movement and depth at the grade level. Mr. Wood said there was a step-down design. Mr. Wood said the standard for the step back design was created for the old LA Fitness site south of Kierland, where single-family homes were on two sides and the design was where this 4-story convention was used with similar distances to the balconies. Mr. Wood said this was used as the guideline for the 4-story portion of the building to the property line of the single-family residences.

Mr. Wood said staff supported lush landscaping and because the proposal has the depth it enhances the landscape along Bell Road and as the landscaping circulates the building itself. Mr. Wood complimented the architecture and said there was a lot of visual interest in items such as the roofline and types of balconies including recessed balconies. Mr. Wood added that the proposed building does not have a long boring façade. Mr. Wood said that most developers want to take advantage of every square foot of the interior and in this case to do more quality design they've included the recessed balconies which add shade and an architectural element.

Mr. Wood stated 71st Street is the entry into the parking structure and the building lobby. Mr. Wood shared the renderings and noted there are a tremendous number of amenities and the parking structure would be screened and the roof becomes the location for a pool, club house, and amenity area. Mr. Wood showed how the building steps down as you move from east to west.

Mr. Wood indicated the site is being down zoned from C-2 which he said allows many more uses that are typically high traffic generators. Mr. Wood shared trip generation numbers and noted that there is no vehicular connection with this project and the subdivision to the west. Mr. Wood added they had worked closely with the neighbors.

### **Questions from Committee**

**Ms. Diane Peterson** asked about the traffic study and was wondering about traffic traveling to and from Scottsdale and traffic going down 71st Street through other neighborhoods which do not have an entrance on Bell Road. **Mr. Wood** said the traffic study shows the use was a low traffic generator. Ms. Peterson was more concerned with the cumulative effect of the traffic and believes this is changing the nature of some of the neighborhoods. Mr. Wood reinforced they were a smaller traffic generator than C-2 zoning.

**Mr. Robert Goodhue** said he goes to the CVS next to the subject site periodically and of all times he has driven through the area and noted there were not many cars traveling and thought the area at times is deserted. Mr. Goodhue asked if the neighbors to the west next to the mini storage supported the project. **Mr. Wood** stated the single-

family neighbors to the west had not shared their support yet, however, they had worked with the neighbors very closely. Mr. Wood indicated they had worked on sight line studies and were discussing landscaping. Mr. Wood said usually privacy is more of an issue than the height of the building and they are trying to work with the neighbors on this matter. Mr. Goodhue said he hoped they could satisfy concerned neighbors.

**Ms. Patrice Marcolla** said it is nice to see redevelopment if the spaces are not being used and was wondering why the commercial spaces of the subject site are not being used. **Mr. Wood** said the seller is not renewing leases.

**Chair Anita Mortensen** asked if parking is all on one level. **Mr. Wood** responded that parking is on each level.

**Ms. Peterson** said she is concerned with the major exit from the building on an easement which is shared by many property owners.

**Chair Mortensen** expressed some concerns that were raised after the meeting associated with the multi-story building proposed at the corner of Scottsdale Road and Bell Road. Chair Mortensen added that the storage building to the west was not very wide and not just one or two individuals would be concerned about height. Chair Mortensen thought four-stories facing the single-family residences would be an issue even if landscaping and buffers were provided in the backyards. **Mr. Wood** said the single-family properties to the west were separated by about one-half a football field away from the proposed four-story portion of the building.

**Ms. Jennifer Hall** asked if there was a drop-off or pick-up area for someone wanting to use rideshare. **Mr. Wood** showed where on the plans there would be space for a drop off near 71st Street. Ms. Hall asked if there was only one way into the project. Mr. Wood said the other driveway on the west side of the site does not punch through.

**Vice Chair Sommers** asked about the landscaping on the west side. **Kevin Farrell** with Fifield Companies noted the plants will be twenty to thirty feet tall when transported.

**Chair Mortensen** asked what type of trees would be planted. Mr. Wood said they had not figured out the exact species of the plant material palette.

**Ms. Hall** asked about the setbacks and had concerns as a lot of buildings are going up in the Kierland area with the buildings being built so close to the road. **Mr. Wood** said this was a legitimate concern, however, he felt they addressed this through detached sidewalks, landscape between sidewalk and the buildings and there is an open area which breaks up the building along the street fronts.

**Ms. Regina Schmidt** said screening trees is the only way to get privacy. **Mr. Wood** said they were working with the neighbors to help address privacy issues.

**Mr. Daniel Mazza** felt this was a well-done project and was impressed with the proposed wrap shielding the parking areas.

**Ms. Peterson** asked about the reaction of Jackson's Car Wash. **Mr. Wood** said the car wash loves the proposal as 71st Street is an easement that everyone has a right to use.

**Ms. Marcolla** asked about guest parking and **Maggie Dellow** with the applicant said it is at 0.5 space per required vehicle parking. **Mr. Wood** added that it is a gated parking structure.