



APPROVED 2/25/2009 bl

**SCOTTSDALE PLANNING COMMISSION  
KIVA-CITY HALL  
3939 DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA**

**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2009**

**STUDY SESSION MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** David Barnett, Chairman  
Eric Hess, Vice Chairman  
Steven Steinke, Commissioner  
Michael D'Andrea, Commissioner

**ABSENT:** Michael Schmitt, Commissioner  
Kevin O'Neill, Commissioner  
Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner

**STAFF:** Connie Padian  
David Reichert  
Joe Padilla  
Lusia Galav  
Kira Wauwie  
Erin Perreault

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Barnett called the study session of the Scottsdale Planning Commission to order at 4:15 p.m.

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present as stated above.

**2. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT**

None.

**3. REVIEW OF FEBRUARY 11, 2009 AGENDA**

**CONTINUANCE**

18-UP-2008                      Southbeach Restaurant & Lounge

17-AB-2008                      Palmeraie

13-ZN-2008                      Palmeraie

Ms. Padian noted that discussions were ongoing with the developer about previous Planning Commission input. Staff has met with the Paradise Valley planning staff regarding how the project can develop across two municipalities.

13-TA-2008                      PRC Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment

Ms. Padian indicated that the interpretation of whether the site would meet the criteria of 25 acres as a combined parcel with one owner should be completed by the end of the week and will be provided to Commissioners and interested parties at that time.

Chairman Barnett inquired about an email from the Paradise Valley Town Council requesting that a Scottsdale Planning Commission representative speak at their meeting on February 12th. A Paradise Valley Planning Commissioner called to ask if he would be attending; however, he had not yet seen the email.

Ms. Padian noted that an email request was received a few hours prior to the meeting. A response was sent stating that the Planning Commission had not seen a full presentation on the case and that Scottsdale Planning staff felt it would be inappropriate for a representative to discuss the case. Chairman Barnett argued that the Planning Commission has seen preliminary presentations on the case twice. He requested that a copy of the email be provided to him prior to the regular meeting in order for him to send an appropriate response.

Commissioner D'Andrea stressed the importance of fully exploring the legal ramifications of capturing the five acres located within Paradise Valley as a tool for meeting the Scottsdale zoning codes.

10-TA-2008                      Outdoor Sales Display and Storage Text  
Amendment

**REGULAR AGENDA**

Discussion and possible initiation of a “major amendment” to modify the major General Plan amendment criteria.

**4. REVIEW OF FEBRUARY 25, 2009 AGENDA**

Ms. Galav noted that the revised second draft of the Downtown Plan would be sent to Planning Commissioners for review well in advance of the February 25th

meeting. The item will be agendaized as a discussion only item on the regular agenda.

**5. DISCUSSION- Staff Presentation and discussion of the draft PUD Ordinance.**

Ms. Wauwie reviewed the purpose of the PUD zoning district, which would provide a combination of land uses in mixed-use development. She provided an overview of the key points resulting from community input. The final draft will be available within two weeks; it is anticipated that a final recommendation will be made in late March.

In response to a question by Commissioner D'Andrea, Ms. Wauwie explained that community input was obtained from the interested parties list as well as a list provided by Planning staff and Economic Vitality staff of applicants interested in accomplishing development that would be possible through the PUD. An economic study is currently being conducted by Gruen Gruen & Associates, which will show benefits of having a PUD district in place.

Commissioner D'Andrea noted the importance of providing a clear understanding of requirements to developers asking for the PUD district.

Commissioner D'Andrea felt that the height requirements throughout the City should be more definitive and should take into consideration mechanical screenings.

In response to a question by Commissioner D'Andrea, Ms. Wauwie explained that analysis was done to identify the acreage that would make the most sense for PUD development; five acres was the best choice for the low end. Ms. Galav noted that one intention was for the PUD to address the range of acreage not covered by other planned districts.

Ms Galav indicated that the Downtown was not included as part of the PUD because it has its own overlay and district. Commissioner D'Andrea requested that a study be conducted to ensure that the Downtown district will allow the same types of development permitted by the PUD.

Chairman Barnett commented that he had envisioned the PUD as a more rigid zoning category than it appears to be. Ms. Galav noted that the PUD would be its own zoning category with a series of criteria that must be met for application. The district will be specialized; however, within the district itself flexibility will be allowed and the plan will be reviewed based on the master development concept plan with very few rigid standards. Height is something that will be addressed in response to community feedback. The process will be elevated because it will be a more contextual process.

Chairman Barnett expressed concern that because additional height will be available in only one district, he feared that the City will become primarily PUD, single-family residential, ESL, and Downtown zoning.

He agreed with Commissioner D'Andrea that the height limitations should include the mechanical equipment. Ms. Galav noted that the draft text allows for mechanical equipment above the base height. Chairman Barnett noted that he would be interested in discussing limiting height to include mechanical equipment once the final text is available for review.

In response to a question by Chairman Barnett, Ms. Wauwie explained that the height allowance of either 48 feet or 78 feet is contextually based; a provision was provided for properties that are adjacent to single-family residential zoning. Setbacks will be based on visibility from adjacent single-family residential yards governed by the development plan. Open space requirements will be slightly less than the R-5 multifamily standard: five percent of the gross floor area for the unit and ten percent of the overall site area.

Ms. Galav explained that the PUD developments must be mixed use, they cannot be strictly residential. The mixed use does not have to include both commercial and office with the residential, it could be commercial and residential, such as would be the case with an artist community.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the regular session of the Planning Commission adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
AV-Tronics, Inc