

1 SUP-15-1
2 Ritz-Carlton Paradise Valley
3

4 -Statement of Direction -
5 May 28, 2015
6

7 On May 4, 2015, the applicant, Five Star Development Resort Communities, submitted a
8 Special Use Permit application to allow for the development of a resort hotel, residential
9 homes, and resort retail at 7000 East Lincoln Drive.
10

11 Section 1102.3 of the Town's Zoning Ordinance states the Town Council must issue a
12 Statement of Direction (SOD) for the Special Use Permit application within 45 days of the
13 first staff presentation. In this case, the Statement of Direction must be issued on or before
14 July 12, 2015.
15

16 The Statement of Direction is not a final decision of the Town Council and does not create
17 any vested rights to the approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP). Any applicant for a Special
18 Use Permit shall not rely upon the matters addressed in the Statement of Direction being the
19 same as those that may be part of an approved Special Use Permit.
20

21 Therefore, the Town Council issues the following Statement of Direction for SUP-15-1, Ritz-
22 Carlton Paradise Valley:
23

- 24 1. The General Plan encourages revitalization and improvement of existing resorts within
25 the Town of Paradise Valley;
26
27 2. The General Plan categorizes this property as a Development Area, intended to focus
28 resort development into targeted areas that are most appropriate for accommodating the
29 variety of land uses associated with such use.
30
31 3. The General Plan further states, Development Areas are meant to encourage new resort
32 development that reflects the Town's needs for fiscal health, economic diversification,
33 and quality of life.
34
35 4. THE PLANNING COMMISSION SHALL REVIEW:
36

37 A. Density

38 Overall density is high with 1,844,650 square feet "occupiable" proposed.

39 Residential and Retail density exceed the Resort Guidelines 25% lot coverage (which
40 may also be understated as the application uses only conditioned space to compute
41 lot coverage). Resort lot coverage is currently at 28.5%.
42

43 **Recommend that all residential and retail density not exceed the 25% lot coverage Resort**
44 **Guideline (per Area) and that it be measured by total lot coverage, not conditioned space**
45 **and that overall density shall be reduced.**
46

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE May 28, 2015

Page 2 of 6

47 Resort lot coverage (Areas "A" and "A1" combined) shall not exceed 30% and 700,000
48 square feet of occupiable space.

49

50 B. Residential lot size

51

52 Areas B and C are detached residential lots. Area C lots are a minimum of 12,000 square
53 feet; Area B lots are a minimum of 9,000 square feet.

54

55 Recommend that all detached residential product in Areas B and C (pick one or more
56 options):

57

58 1. Have a much larger minimum and average lot size, with a variety of lot sizes and
59 larger lots considered along the perimeter, or

60

61 2. Increase lot size in area B to a minimum of 12,000 sf and increase the lot size in
62 area C to a minimum of 16,000 sf, or

63

64 3. Reduce the total lot number in Areas B & C by 30% from 160 lots to 112 lots. (2.24
65 du per acre), or

66

67 4. Have an average of two dwelling units per acre, and

68

69 5. Progress from larger lots on the north, south, and west perimeters to more dense
70 lots in the center and eastern perimeter.

71

72 6. Detached residential product shall be a mix of 1 and 2 story.

73

74 7. Setbacks shall be proposed in a Land density table for all lot types

75 Condominiums are proposed for Areas D & E. Condominiums, as approved and built
76 in other Paradise Valley resorts, are almost exclusively used as resort rental units that
77 are rented through the resort itself (such as is identified for Area A-1).

78 Condominiums are disfavored and alternate uses for Areas D and E shall be explored.

79 Area E shall only be reviewed in conjunction with the Palmeriae portion in the City of
80 Scottsdale and not as a separate parcel.

81

82

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE May 28, 2015

Page 3 of 6

83 C. Heights

84 Heights far exceed Resort Guidelines' 36' maximum for principal structures and 24'
85 height for accessory structures. Many principal structures are proposed at 48' and
86 some accessory structures are proposed at 36' and 48'. While some additional height
87 may be allotted to provide a transition or buffering from the four-story apartment and
88 three-story office buildings located in the City of Scottsdale, a three-story – 36'
89 maximum was anticipated, stepping down to two and then one-story.

90
91 **Recommend that all four-story/48' tall elements be eliminated and three-story/36'**
92 **maximum height be considered for primary structures only, and/or as a buffer along the**
93 **eastern border.**

94 Grand lobby height is not clear. Application shows up to 22' of fill under the
95 structure with up to 6' of cut through the center of the fill area. Elevations show 22' to
96 47' heights on the resort structure.

97 **Recommend that Commission allow such lobby heights to capture the unique**
98 **mountain views but fully explore the impacts of the proposed height including what**
99 **is visible off-site and if current views of the Mc Dowell Mountains will be obstructed**
100 **(as viewed from the adjoining public RsOW). The overall mass of the building shall be**
101 **reviewed to make sure it is of appropriate scale. A 3-D graphic shall be required. An**
102 **elevation shall be shown from a benchmark near the intersection of Lincoln Dr. and**
103 **Mockingbird Lane.**
104

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE May 28, 2015

Page 4 of 6

105 D. Retail Use

106
107 Retail square footage is proposed at over 160,000 square feet, including a grocery
108 store-type use at 36,400 sf. Although the Resort Guidelines anticipate less retail on
109 standard resort properties, this property is not standard - it is in a designated
110 Development Area and is approximately four times the size of a standard Paradise
111 Valley resort.

112
113 Council is not opposed to retail but requires a market study addressing the feasibility
114 of the type and the amount of retail proposed including the viability of retail located
115 on an interior site. Applicant must provide additional information on the category of
116 retail and commercial uses proposed and the potential clients leasing this space.

117
118 Determine whether the Council is: (1) comfortable with setting parameters on the
119 retail component and de-annexing the retail component to Scottsdale so that it can be
120 planned as one overall retail mixed-use plan along with Five Star's adjoining 18.5 acre
121 Palmeraie parcel in Scottsdale, or (2) comfortable with creating an intergovernmental
122 agreement with the City of Scottsdale to plan the parcel as a whole while retaining the
123 existing acreage in each municipality.

124
125 Commission may be directed to study the type of retail, amount of retail, height and
126 setbacks on the retail structures, etc.

127
128 E. Perimeter Setbacks/Open Space

129 Only 25' setback is proposed along portions of Indian Bend, Lincoln, and Mockingbird
130 Lane.

131 No setback is given between the proposed residential product in Area B and the north
132 boundary of St. Barnabas.

133 Interior drives in Areas C & D do not meet 40' setback guidelines.

134
135 Recommend that the SUP Guideline landscape area and buffer be provided. A minimum
136 50' wide landscaped area shall be provided along Lincoln Drive and Mockingbird Roads
137 and a minimum of 30' wide landscape area shall be provided along Indian Bend Road. An
138 additional landscape buffer shall be provided at the corner of Lincoln Drive and
139 Mockingbird Lane, as well as at the main entrance to the Resort and at the gateway to the
140 Town.

141
142 An Open Space Element shall be provided by the applicant. It shall address both
143 private and public open spaces, passive and active recreation, and
144 undeveloped/natural areas. The Resort Guideline of 40% open space shall be
145 followed. The Commission shall review this element and also consider landscape

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE May 28, 2015

Page 5 of 6

146 buffering as a transition from the large scale development along the eastern border
147 with the City of Scottsdale.

148
149

150 F. Rights-of-Way/Traffic/Parking

151

152 All roadway amenities such as sidewalks, medians, round-a-bouts, deceleration lanes,
153 and traffic/pedestrian signals shall be reviewed and designed to meet Town
154 Engineering Department standards.

155

156 Traffic and Parking Study shall be reviewed.

157

158 Recommend the Commission utilize a Town hired third-party engineer to review the
159 traffic, parking (both above and below ground), and circulation study prepared by the
160 applicant. The review shall include impacts from the proposed development and
161 surrounding development.

162

163 Vehicular circulation shall be reviewed. Particular emphasis shall be placed on all ingress
164 and egress points.

165

166 Lincoln Drive shall be viewed as a “Visually Significant Corridor” in accordance with
167 the General Plan standards and a cross section with a typical landscape treatment
168 shall be reviewed.

169

170 Lincoln Drive is also a Gateway to the Town and special design consideration should be
171 reviewed to reflect this entrance to the Town.

172

173 Recommend that 25’ of Right of Way (ROW) dedication be required along Lincoln
174 Drive. This differs from the 2008 SUP that allowed for a roadway easement. The
175 2012 General Plan has now categorized Lincoln Drive as a Visually Significant
176 Corridor and dedication is requested to allow for development of Lincoln Drive as a
177 Visually Significant Corridor and as a Gateway to the Town. The applicant shall
178 identify setbacks from the post-dedication property line.

179

180

181

182 G. Additional Review Items

183 Landscaping plan will need more detail. Commission shall focus their review on the
184 exterior landscaping along the Rights of Way.

185 Wall master plan must be examined. A meandering alternative shall be explored for
186 the perimeter.

187

Statement of Direction

SUP-15-1

DATE May 28, 2015

Page 6 of 6

188 Monument sign placement and size parameters shall be established.

189

190 Recommend that the Commission utilize a Town hired third-party engineer to review
191 the grading and drainage study prepared by the applicant with emphasis on the
192 necessary retention requirements and the proposed rerouting of the natural wash. A
193 detailed grading and drainage plan for the site will need to be provided that is in
194 conformance with the most current version of the Town of Paradise Valley Storm
195 Drain Design Manual – Subdivision Drainage Design at time of permit submittal.

196

197

198 Pedestrian and non-vehicular circulation shall be reviewed.

199

200 H. Keys to Success

201

202 The results of the Community Meeting, the Keys to Success, shall be considered when
203 reviewing this proposal.

204

205 I. Stipulations

206

207 The Planning Commission may craft stipulations to address landscaping, utility and
208 mechanical equipment screening and locations, resort operational issues, and special
209 regulatory standards (such as hours of operation, amplified music, etc..) and other
210 land use concerns not otherwise in conflict with this SOD.

211

212 J. Deviations from the SUP Guidelines

213

214 The Planning Commission shall address any improvements/uses that deviate from
215 the SUP Resort Guidelines and the applicant must provide a justification for the
216 deviation from the Guidelines.

217

218 The Planning Commission shall not address development agreement issues such as
219 financing and phasing of construction.

220

221 The Planning Commission shall complete its review and hearing process in 150
222 calendar days from the first presentation to Commission (per Section 2-5-2.D.1 of the
223 Town Code).

224

225

226