

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

Introduction

The Town of Paradise Valley conducted its second community survey for the 2022 General Plan Update, from November 1, 2021 – January 3, 2022. For this survey, the Town sought general feedback on the 60-Day Public Review Draft of the 2022 General Plan. The survey was made available online as well as circulated in print format via the Town Reporter, a periodic newsletter that is published by the Town and mailed to all 7,093 Paradise Valley residences.

A total of 63 (36 online and 27 print) direct survey responses and 20 indirect email or comment card responses were collected over the two-month survey period. For full transparency, all survey results and open-ended comments received are provided within the following sections and tables.

Survey Results

In the online survey, respondents were first asked to review all Goals associated with each Element (or Chapter) of the General Plan and indicate if they felt the Goals adequately address and provide guidance for Paradise Valley. The following table identifies the level of support expressed, through the 36 online surveys collected, for each set of goals within each Element of the General Plan. For reference, it is also important to note, some submitted surveys did not respond to all survey questions.

2022 General Plan Elements	Overall Goal Support	
	Yes % (# responses)	No % (# responses)
Land Use	51% (18)	49% (17)
Community Character & Housing	52% (17)	48% (16)
Mobility	63% (19)	37% (11)
Open Space	65% (20)	35% (11)
Environmental Planning & Water Resources	68% (21)	32% (10)
Sustainability	72% (23)	28% (9)
Public Facilities/Service & Cost of Development	83% (24)	17% (5)

Due to space limitations within the Town Reporter, the print version of the survey presented one general question to gauge if respondents felt the overall Goals in the General Plan adequately address and provide guidance for Paradise Valley. The following table identifies the level of support, expressed through the 27-print surveys collected, for all goals within the General Plan. For reference, it is also important to note, some submitted surveys did not respond to all survey questions.

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

2022 General Plan	Overall Goal Support	
	Yes % (# responses)	No % (# responses)
All General Plan Goals	39% (7)	61% (12)

In response to community input, the survey also addressed several specific issues or topics that were directly addressed within select “Policies” that help to support the overarching General Plan Goals. Respondents were asked to review the following modifications and identify their level of support on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the strongest level of support and 1 being the lowest level of support.

Modification	Level of Support (Print Survey/Online Survey)					Average Ranking	Total Answers	Skipped
	Low 1	2	Moderate 3	4	High 5			
Within the Land Use Element, the Town’s three existing Development Areas (56th Street and Lincoln Drive, East Lincoln Drive North, and East Lincoln Drive South), created to focus resort development and redevelopment areas, have been removed in favor of utilizing the Town’s long-standing Special Use Permit (SUP) zoning process.	11/7	1/2	2/11	1/4	7/9	3	55	8
Within the Land Use & Open Space Elements, policy edits were made to clarify the preference for use of existing public areas (i.e. trailheads near Town limits) and private areas (i.e. residents own backyards) over the development of new areas or facilities.	4/5	0/4	1/4	2/6	7/12	4	45	18

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

Within the Community Character & Housing Element, specific policies were incorporated to address neighborhood safety and residential character issues that arise from the adverse impacts of short-term rentals in the community.	1/1	0/2	0/2	1/4	11/23	4	45	18
Within the Mobility Element, Town-wide integrated pedestrian and bicycle circulation systems were removed and replaced with policies that support best practices to mitigate negative impacts and address public safety to ease neighborhood and bicycle conflicts.	2/3	0/2	0/6	1/7	10/14	4	45	18
Within the Mobility Element, new policies were added to address community feedback related to addressing vehicular and non-vehicular safety, traffic congestion, as well as cut-through and pass-through traffic.	1/1	0/1	0/9	1/4	11/16	4	44	19

Survey Comments

Within both the online and print version of the survey, each group of questions included space for open-ended responses or comments. A total of 83 individual comments were recorded which are listed below in the order they were received. In some instances, specific personal identifiable information or inappropriate language was redacted.

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

#	Comment	Author	Date Received
1.	<p>Serious safety issue at 56th/Doubletree intersection caused by vehicles traveling East to West on Doubletree failing to stop at the stop sign. Similar incidents in our neighborhood have happened at 52nd/Doubletree, Invergordon/Doubletree, and 56th St/Mockingbird Lane. My suggestions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve visibility and conspicuity of ALL stop signs in the TOPV – especially at 56th/Doubletree. • Improve public awareness and measures to improve their safety • Consider opportunities for improved intersection design. 	Robert Sterrett Jr.	9/11/2021
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the subject of El Chorro, the concern of numerous residents is that consideration of the General Plan is not the right time and place for discussing this problem. The General Plan is, surely, a vehicle for vision statements which relate to the whole future of the Town and the entire community rather than solving isolated issues. It does seem that the issue of El Chorro should be handled in the normal fashion i.e. as a modification/amendment to the General Plan... at a later date and without the pressure of any deadlines... and, be more conducive to the right solution. There is no urgency to solve the El Chorro problem. However, there are looming deadlines and an urgency to discuss all the very important major aspects of the General Plan. • Remove the classification of "Multi modal transport site per CIP" on the town owned lot of 1.75 acres on the corner of Scottsdale Road and Doubletree. • The town owned lot, on the corner of Scottsdale Road and Doubletree, is an eyesore. Selling this lot at public auction seems like a good plan. Another possible solution to this eyesore is to create a public open space which discourages "passive recreation or casual interaction". A rock and cactus garden would be inexpensive to create, require little or no maintenance. would be very uncomfortable for squatters and would give a much better "arrival experience" to our Town. So, two possible solutions for you to consider. 	Marel Brady	10/11/2021
3.	<p>I had a chance to review the pending General Plan Update and had one important comment which I believe will be a huge issue in the future--if not immediately:</p> <p>One of the things that the Town will need to address long term is access to technology. We are moving right now to 5G and that requires more cell towers (not less). Presumably we will then move beyond 5G and whatever that will bring. Acknowledging that the State has preempted cities and towns (again!) on this issue, what can we do to solve this problem? Imagine a world where we have moved way beyond 5G and we have either unsightly towers all around town or we are stuck in an old 4G world--which would make living in Paradise Valley increasingly unattractive. I do not think that the General Plan needs to directly solve this problem, but it needs to recognize that this is an area of concern and somehow indicate this as an area of focus. I think it deserves its own category in the Plan. As an aside, I think the solution should be something like the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify any local residents who are tech experts and have domain knowledge in this area. • Develop a strategic partnership with the cell phone companies that would preserve our local character. There may well be lots of solutions here. 	Tim Dickman	10/25/21

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

4.	<p>CC&H Goal 5 needs to be reworded. It is ambiguous. Goal M1. Take out multimodal. Nobody knows what that means. The term is confusing and ambiguous. If you're talking about public transport, be transparent and say so. Goal 3. Nobody wants regional transit services. Take it out.</p> <p>Goal M4. Wording is ambiguous and not transparent. Cannot support this.</p> <p>Goal M5. Why are we creating streets? We have enough, already. Goal OS1. Take out "expand".</p> <p>Goal OS3. What is an "open space system"? Be specific and transparent.</p> <p>Sustainability Goals - We don't need education or action on sustainability. The whole world is wasting too much time and energy on this.</p>	Anonymous	11/2/2021
5.	<p>Mobility Goals - Though improvements have been made, cut through traffic on Stanford drive is still too high in volume and in speed. In addition, traffic congestion caused by PCDS is a hazard and needs to be addressed. The median could be removed in front of the school so that a turning lane is created allowing residents to get by. In addition, the 40th St side of PCDS should be utilized for drop off and pick up.</p> <p>This issue has been going on for years and needs to be resolved.</p> <p>Environmental & Water Planning Goals- I agree, but building and particularly landscape noise have gotten out of control. Leaf blowers should be banned. They are terrible for the environment and the noise is constantly disruptive. The Town needs to address this asap.</p>	Anonymous	11/2/2021
6.	<p>LU Goals - Overall, I think the plan is great, but it could be stronger for protecting residential views. Ensuring that someone doesn't build a house that blocks another's view is important for this plan. Many people live here for the views, and the individual views need to be protected with building height requirements. I would say that only single story could be built if a 2 story would block someone's existing view. An existing view should supersede a new build. CC&H Goals - Same response as above. The Town could do more to preserve the character and views of homeowners. Q16 open response: Great job. Please preserve PV. I am concerned that my views could be obstructed by a builder wanting to build a 2- story house in my neighborhood of 1-story homes. I strong support retaining housing height limits at this point.</p>	Anonymous	11/3/2021
7.	<p>CC&H Goals- Character being adversely impacted by rapid growth. PSF Goals -Need strict enforcement of no trucks on small streets. This is a safety hazard</p>	Anonymous	11/08/2021
8.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please eliminate “planner speak” – examples are “multi-modal circulation”, “regional transit”. • Provide a Glossary of terms for any terms in the GP that have special meaning or are terms of art. In particular “open space” as there is a long history of that term’s use in Town planning and zoning. • Further clarification that “open spaces” is not intended to mean new parks, etc., was requested • “Gathering places” concept also seems open to interpretation. If intended to mean Town Hall, our resorts and our houses of worship some clarification may help. • The "glossary of terms" suggestion is based on the number of times I've heard the Mayor answer the same questions regarding various terminology used in the General Plan (GP). I understand that state law requires certain elements be addressed in the GP and that "planning 	Bryan Brady, Brian Schwalbe, and Jim Anton	11/8/21

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

	professional" terminology is appropriate and the most effective language to use in the document. I thought a glossary might help span the gap between what professionals understand and what the average citizen might interpret. If allowed as part of the document, or as an addendum, a "glossary of terms" might save the Mayor, Council, and planning staff, the time and effort required to repeatedly clarify terminology.		
9.	CC&H Goals- Housing with less than 1 acre needs to be reduced or minimized in future implementation. Sustainability Goals- In particular, the implementation of electric charging stations at the town is an overreach that should not be funded by public spending. If a resident of our town elects to have an EV vehicle, they certainly have the means to provide their own charging capability at their property. Likewise, we would never have considered a gas station funded by the public and on town public property.	Anonymous	11/9/2021
10.	My Councils spent lots of time and town resources to get all the power lines underground to create and enhance our open spaces and residential character. Having sidewalks closer to our streets does not enhance public safety (really the opposite) and will reduce the open spaces our town has left.	Edward F. Lowry, Jr., PC	11/11/2021
11.	There is such an erosion of our town culture, open space and desert landscapes and views. We are distressed by the scraping of the lots all around us.	Susan F. Shultz	11/12/21
12.	I am a 30 year resident of the town of Paradise Valley. I live in an older neighborhood where the houses are being flattened and mega mansions put up. The setback space is very important to me as a long time resident. I am against making the setbacks smaller. Builder profits are at an all time high. I am disappointed in the Town of Paradise Valley over the amount of concessions they have made to developers. Don't even get me started on the Ritz!	Janine Brown	11/12/21
13.	As a TPV resident, the issue of construction disruption is becoming a huge quality of life concern for many residents and friends in the town I have spoken to. While it is certainly exciting to see growth in PV, and I have no issue with change and progress if it is managed right, it is depressing that the quiet and tranquility that brought us here is pretty much gone and shows no sign of going away for years to come. The issue is that the homes being built are so massive that they are years-long projects. I think I can summarize the issues as follows: 1. Neighbors are not notified or warned when a huge construction project arises. On Cactus Wren Road, we were awoken this past Monday by cranes tearing down 6500 E. Cactus Wren Road on Monday morning, and dealing with the ensuing noise, dust, etc. So point 1 is notification of this so we are prepared. 2. Point 2 is that there seems to be no accountability for timely completion of projects. 3. Is there something about how much construction can go on around existing neighborhoods? Maybe we are just unlucky but we have massive construction going on to the south, east, north and west of us. 4. Despite the town's ordinance about loud noises not starting before 7AM (and 9AM on weekends?), the construction companies have little incentive to abide by them. Is there really any accountability to the construction companies to abide by the rules? Yes, we have called the Town and the Police, but not sure if anything changes as they are still doing construction pre-dawn.	Melanie & Bruce Polk	11/12/21

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

14.	A key tenet in the founding of The Town of Paradise Valley was to preserve the area’s rural character. Hence, the requirements for a minimum lot size of one acre, the absence of street lights and, ultimately, the placement of underground utility lines among other measures. Today, we are all beneficiaries of these forward looking decisions made by the founders of our community. Town Councils down through the years have typically been good stewards of the Town’s original vision.	Bruce Mowery	11/12/2021
15.	We need to preserve open space and the low density, semi-rural character of our neighborhoods.	Eric Ende & Becky Keenan	11/12/2021
16.	It’s the space and the landscaping that really make the difference when you pass from PHX or Scottsdale into PV.	Paul E. Moore	11/12/2021
17.	The past setback compromise from 40' to 20' is now at further risk with this 10' proposal. By nibbling away at our setbacks, we will create the visual perception of dense canyon corridors. If we are committed to preserving our character, a cornerstone of our premiere residential status, this must be stopped.	Linda Peterson Warren	11/12/2021
18.	The number one priority to I and others who call Paradise Valley home – by your own survey is low density housing, the aesthetic beauty of our mountains and nature - over 88% reported this as #1 priority. Thus, the real question on the latest issue – what are the pros that will come of increasing the limits of fences to ten rather than twenty feet? I am opposed to this - I see this taking away from natural space (not in a huge way but this is my reason for opposition). We want leadership that leads with positive engagement with each other and the public. Keep us a positive, informed community with the aesthetic beauty of our natural surroundings being the number one priority.	Teresa Zachariah	11/13/2021
19.	PV should keep its "open space policy." Otherwise, we, the citizens, are going to lose our views of the beautiful place in which we live: our mountains, our desert, Camelback Mountain, The Praying Monk, Piestewa Peak, etc. This is one of the greatest reasons we are willing to pay a higher price to live in PV.	Jonae DeLong	11/14/2021
20.	The General Plan is not the appropriate means to correct an issue with respect to a zoning issue El Chorro faces. El Chorro has an appropriate viable pathway to rectifying this through PV’s normal process. Choosing to insert a specific zoning matter into the General Plan would set a terrible and unnecessary precedence.	Sherry Bove	11/15/2021
21.	The beauty of this town is the spaciousness and privacy of our neighborhoods.	Kathleen Monheit	11/16/2021
22.	Already, many of the new homes constructed in my area are creating a look of a cookie cutter ordinary subdivision of “McMansions”, with massive homes already close to the streets, already blocking our mountain views and wildlife corridors. The whole charm of Paradise Valley as a unique and inspiring town is being eroded already, without this new proposed reduction of open space. Lot line to lot line building surely has gone far enough! Certainly from the real estate market, home and land values seem not to have had any negative impact from our current requirements. I want to maintain my home value and investment along with the town’s unique setting.	Robin Daggett	11/18/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

23.	<p>EPW Goals -The noise pollution concept doesn't seem to be in line with reality. We have a policy that doesn't allow you to make any noise at all on your own property? A child jumping into a swimming pool or even low volume background music playing in your backyard can trigger a fine? Yet, large trucks are allowed to drive down Lincoln delivering decibels 1.5-2x the allowed limit.</p>	Anonymous	11/21/2021
24.	<p>Mobility Goals- I believe a review of existing speed limits throughout Paradise Valley needs to be accomplished. My wife and I live on E. McDonald; just west of the township sign. Traffic enters E. McDonald in two lanes, which then change to one. This stretch of McDonald has become a race track with cars constantly speeding to get one car in front. When Kiva school is open, traffic is supposed to slow to 15 mph, when the school is closed and the 15 mph limit is no longer in affect, cars continue down E. McDonald above the speed limit. Also, the daily line of cars dropping off and collecting children is a safety hazard and many times we are unable to pull into our drive as cars are backed up either side of the school in the center. Given there is a church, school and synagogue in the first block or so of E. McDonald I feel the speed limit should be dropped to 25 mph - same as at the west end of McDonald where the trail head congestion forms.</p> <p>EPW Goals -EPW.4 I do not believe the township is serious with regard to noise ordinances. We have the misfortune of backing onto the open lot behind The Andez. Town noise code is 56dBA Monday-Saturday, with a 10.00pm cut off. Sunday's it's supposed to be 45dBA. We have to endure weddings and other gatherings every Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Some weeks there are events mid-week too. The events rarely keep within code with dBA's regularly reaching 75dBA and above. Even when the DJ/music stops the crowd noise continues sometimes into the early hours of the morning. When the noise becomes unbearable I place a call with PV Police, who measure the noise levels either at our rear property wall in our yard or in the open lot behind us. After confirming the noise level is in excess of code they call the hotel. Noise levels sometimes reduce, but usually increase again necessitating yet another call to PV Police, (BTW - PV Police have been great and I sense just as frustrated). I've also personally reached out to Raj The Andez GM, while empathetic of the disturbance informed me that he's staff are monitoring noise levels and are aware of the code, which clearly cannot be true given this is a weekly occurrence; some weekends consecutive days. Our rear outdoor's, pool and patio have become unusable due to the constant, excessive DJ/music and crowd noise. I've reached out to Tina Brindley and shared our experience, with attached dBA meter readings, but nothing changes. I'd like to understand what further steps are to be taken to address this untenable situation. PSF Goals -PFS.4 I don't believe the township ensure compliance with existing noise ordinances and code. Per my response to EPW.4, there doesn't appear to be any consequences or actions taken against The Andez who appear unable/unwilling to try and integrate with the neighborhood. Their total disregard to stay within noise code limits, weekend after weekend clearly demonstrates there are no consequences repercussions. Q16 Open Ended Question -1. Re-assess speed limits on Paradise Valley streets. Per my response to the Mobility Section, the speed limit and addressing the congestion caused by drop-off pick-up at Kiva School on E. McDonald Road needs urgent attention before there is a serious accident. 2. With further emphasis on resort development, the township</p>	Anonymous	11/27/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

	needs to ensure that existing noise codes are adhered to and infringements seriously addressed to stop the "creep" of noise pollution.		
25.	Just want to complement you on the publication of the draft General Plan, which is well written and easy to navigate. Well done!	Marel Brady	12/04/2021
26.	LU Goals -A glaring omission is Town Owned Land - this needs to be included.CC&H Goals- On Goal 5, the wording "allowing" and all the following words need to be removed. Mobility Goals- Be specific. If you're talking about bikes, say so. If you're talking about buses, say so. We don't want more of anything in the Town. Please work on the mantra that "less is more." OS Goals- Remove the healthy lifestyle. We all live on an acre lot with swimming pools, or else we live in a gated community with tennis courts and other facilities. We don't need open spaces dedicated to anything other than preserving the views. EPW Goals - These goals ignore the functionality of the numerous natural and manmade Washes which run through the Town. A whole section on this is required. Sustainability Goals - The goals are okay, but this should not be your focus. Please don't waste any time or money on sustainability. Overall- Two glaring omissions on the General Plan 1) Town owned land 2) Functionality and maintenance of manmade and natural Washes	Anonymous	12/07/21
27.	LU Goals - not enough emphasis on residential neighborhood protection. Too much encouragement for more hotels. CC&H Goals - Does not adequately address the traffic, light and noise pollution by large resorts. OS Goals - need more attention to the visual impact and view obstruction of commercial properties including resorts. EPW Goals - Air traffic is not the only detrimental noise pollution. Strict decibel noise levels should be stated and enforced, especially by venues that amplify their music and announcements	Anonymous	12/07/2021
28.	PFS Goals - Cease being in the alarm monitoring business! Overall- Reduce or manage pelotons riding through our community and the lack of respect for motorists.	Anonymous	12/8/2021
29.	LU Goals - The special use permit for development has allowed too much density, traffic and infringement on existing residences. Overall- The special use permit process goals are inadequate to protect residential and home values. I believe the current rezoning rules should apply equally to all and object to a special shortcut for El Chorro developers. Fairly applying the current rules protects us.	Anonymous	12/8/2021
30.	LU Goals - Special Use Permits are opaque. CC&H Goals -Special Use permits are not consistent with goals. OS Goals - Make Special Use permits less opaque. Overall - "Special" Use Permit Zoning are opaque "rubber stamp" short-cuts that should be avoided.	Anonymous	12/8/2021
31.	LU Goals- I believe, as the plan itself states in the full online version, that the Town of Paradise Valley resort development goals have been fulfilled, and I strongly prefer prioritizing our neighborhood preservation and quality of life over building any more large hotels. I would like to see this made clearer in the goals. Overall -I am very much against changing the current rezoning rules in any way. They should apply equally to all, and I specifically object to any special shortcut for El Chorro developers. If you just fairly apply the existing rules, our neighborhoods will be better protected.	Anonymous	12/08/2021
32.	LU Goals -The goals are vague and can be interpreted in ways that will not serve the town's residents' best interests. CC&H Goals- Does not address the issue of heights that would block existing views. Overall- I am	Anonymous	12/08/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

	very concerned about developers who bring vague albeit attractive plans to the town council when the reality is a completely different sort of project. I am strongly opposed to short-term rentals i.e. party houses which create noise, trash and potential crime. Instead of meaningless statements in the plan, let our town council members develop specifics that residents can evaluate what exactly is meant in each section of the plan.		
33.	LU Goals- Make sure the Special Use Permit is followed closely to not impact adjoining residential. Stay within the geographic, meaning footprint, of existing permitted space during improvement process (LU6.1). CC&H Goals -Make sure the open character of the town is kept with adequate setbacks and low walls.	Anonymous	12/08/2021
34.	LU Goals - Sorry but an explanation of your Special Use Permit would be helpful and also understand that you haven't mentioned anything on your Town Owned land and how that will be handled!!!!!! CC&H Goals- Totally don't think much attention in preserving scenic mountain lines had been met when houses are being erected on top of our mountains that have been sheared off at their tops. Very sad! EPW Goals - No mention about the maintenance of our washes! Need more tree inventory especially on Lincoln between 32nd St. & Tatum. How do you reduce noise pollution????	Anonymous	12/08/2021
35.	Omitted: Residence need to be able to provide input on use etc of town own land	Anonymous	12/09/2021
36.	On page 7 of the Town Reporter it states 1/3 acre landlocked parcel adjacent to El Chorro Lodge was changed from Low Density Residential to Resort/Country Club. I oppose this change. This change appears to be a prelude to a resort being built on this site. I oppose any additional resorts in Paradise Valley. This suggested change should not be included in the 2022 General Plan.	Anonymous	12/09/2021
37.	Mobility Goals - Manage, monitor, limit public transportation routes only to those major routes where required for public access, not to private residential areas. Monitor and Manage traffic flows so that high density traffic does not flow in residential areas and routes.	Anonymous	12/13/2021
38.	In the new plan where are the nice -no rocks running paths (concrete is too hard- the asphalt road is dangerous)? Like 56th St? all other dirt areas are getting filled in with rocks	Janie White	12/13/2021
39.	The Plan for the next year looks good. My main interest is solving the short term rental problem	Anonymous	12/13/2021
40.	I am concerned that the vision and values of PV have been compromised by developers. I strongly believe that this very special community needs to be protected. Safety and maintaining quiet neighborhoods and mountain views is very important to me. I am opposed to El Charro getting special treatment.	Anonymous	12/14/2021
41.	Good to develop long range plan but please, no more resorts and traffic along Lincoln. There should be no zoning shortcuts for developers. Enough resorts and traffic on Lincoln without further development.	Anonymous	12/14/2021
42.	Allowing shortcuts for hotel developers is totally against everything PV has ever stood for. If the Hotel uses don't meet with the approval of the residents they simply shouldn't happen. We have to live here and limiting commercial development has always been important to all of us.	Anonymous	12/15/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

43.	Zero support for any development of this area. Over developed as it is.	Anonymous	12/15/2021
44.	I think the traffic is overwhelming. I don't think the founder of PV wanted to make a hotel corridor out of our 1 house per acre zoning. We need no new development. That will increase noise and traffic.	Anonymous	12/15/2021
45.	I agree with the plan overall. However, I am very concerned about over development along the Lincoln Avenue Corridor. Traffic has really increased- and it will be for worse once the Ritz Carlton is complete. Right now, there are noisy parties with bands at El Chorro. I am opposed to further development there. I support the process. This statement is poorly phrased (SUP Process). I support a thorough review process for all plans.	Anonymous	12/15/2021
46.	Adhere to a strict special uses plan. We have way to much noise in my community already.	Anonymous	12/15/2021
47.	No more hotels! The plan says the resort corridor goals have been met, yet asks to give El Charro a special zoning change. Prioritize residential neighborhoods.	Anonymous	12/15/2021
48.	ALL Goals- We should not change the 1/3 acre on El Chorro Lodge from low density residential to resort/country club. They should adhere to the same zoning regulations as everyone else. Add no additional hotel/motel rooms in PV. There has been no need shown!	Anonymous	12/16/2021
49.	LU Goals- I believe that the current zoning rules should apply equally to all and I firmly object to a making a concession for El Chorro. Why should permission be granted? I see no rationale for this. I live to the west of El Chorro and I am already bombarded frequently with music and other loud noises. Fairly applying the current rules will at least provide some level of protection to the neighboring properties. I see no need for more large resorts in Paradise Valley and strongly prefer prioritizing our neighborhood preservation and quality of life over building more large hotels. Overall -It is interesting that much of this plan does address the quality of life in this wonderful town, but then there is the issue of allowing resort development outside of the current zoning that is allowed. I honestly don't understand why this would be allowed and I hope it will be rejected.	Anonymous	12/16/2021
50.	We prefer focusing on neighborhood preservation and quality of life over building additional hotels. They have enough hotels.	Anonymous	12/17/2021
51.	Two items that are very important to my family are: 1) Short term rentals. Need to enact tougher policies to prohibit, monitor, and enforce penalties on these absentee homeowners who allow bad behavior. It's simply unsafe and a leading cause for us to want to relocate. 2)Enforcement/modifications of noise ordinances. The noise from landscapers is worse than the trucks constantly doing construction in this town. Need better enforcement and fines against the homeowners who allow the landscapers to work at all times, 7 days a week. Weekend work should be prohibited. What is the point of living in this beautiful environment if we can't even relax quietly in our own back yards? Also, consider implementing an electric leaf blower mandate, similar to what California has imposed and New Jersey is considering. This is both more environmentally friendly and quieter.	Anonymous	12/18/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

52.	LU Goals- In reading the plan, I felt there was too much latitude for future resort development/expansion. Sustainability Goals -In light of private property rights and various other plan elements, it is unclear to me what is intended here. I didn't see many specific action items relating to many of the sustainability topics in the Plan.	Anonymous	12/18/2021
53.	It's ok but not happy that new owner of El Chorro gets easy pass when I need to go through a lot of hassle with my permits. Berneil and other washes need to go on map. Town owned land needs to change to public open space. Keep us Semi-Rural. No Parks. No buses. No bike lanes	Anonymous	12/20/2021
54.	No parks or buses or bikes. Corner lot on Scottsdale and Doubletree Should go on map. El Chorro map clean up not good. All names washes should go on map.	Anonymous	12/20/2021
55.	very annoyed about El Chorro Map clean up. Use normal process. Named washes need to go on map. Please change classification of town owned land from residential to parks/open space. (Why?) and Town Reporter reach me after days of mishaps	Anonymous	12/20/2021
56.	Put named washes on map. Lot on corner of Doubletree and Scottsdale Rd. should be discussed in terms of future plans. No Bikes, No Parks, No Buses	Anonymous	12/20/2021
57.	Town owned land needs to be shown on maps. Voters need the opportunity to vote on the use of Town owned land in particular the lot on the corner of Scottsdale Road and Doubletree. Berneil Wash needs to be shown on maps. Maintenance of manmade washes (Berneil) in particular needs to be included.	Anonymous	12/20/2021
58.	well written. Needs to include named washes on map. Town owned land designation needs to change from residential to public open space	Anonymous	12/20/2021
59.	Do Not sell out neighborhood privacy, value and tranquility that protect homes. No shortcuts for El Chorro developers. Protect the residential Quality of Life. El Chorro adds blocked views, rodents, too much noise. We believe as the plan: LU3, LU6 Strongly prioritize our neighborhood preservation and quality of life over building more large hotels. ie. "party house" affecting neighborhoods	Anonymous	12/21/2021
60.	This Paradise Valley was supposed to be a neighborhood of 1 or more acres per one home. This town is turning into a thoroughfare for people throughout Maricopa County. Also this Resort Corridor is impossible for PV residents to get into and out of their homes! Stop the hotel/motel resorts. Special Uses weren't meant for the developers/owners who applied for them. The new lawyers were not meant to be able to continue up/down the zoning. Stop the building along Lincoln Drive. The Traffic is dangerous to homeowners in the area!	Anonymous	12/21/2021
61.	I would vote to add no more resorts. There has been no need shown. Also the 1/3 acre land locked parcel should not be changed to Resort/Country Club. Like all residents they should be regulated by current regulations.	Anonymous	12/21/2021
62.	I have lived in Paradise for 48 years. Paradise Valley is like a jewel in the desert. A gem in the eye of a hurricane! Please don't stir it up!! My wife Kathy and I will fight tooth and nail. To stop any hotel/condo development on the El Chorro land. We have enough resort developments on Lincoln. Enough is enough! Thank you!	Tom and Kathy Van Arsdale	12/21/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

63.	The plan does not adequately address excessive noise, especially from resorts. Please add this with firm enforced limits (not just cut off times)	Anonymous	12/21/2021
64.	More attention and enforcement is needed so our backyards are not ruined by resort noise	Anonymous	12/21/2021
65.	Residential neighborhoods should be priority over resort development. The development is or has been realized. Do what you say. El Chorro developers should not dictate zoning changes. Too vague we need to focus on low density character and quality of life. We already have issues with noise, view interruptions and traffic.	Anonymous	12/21/2021
66.	Better communications. We don't need more resorts. Please preserve our neighborhood environment. They become very noisy and loud at times, especially in the evenings. We oppose this proposed expansion and developments. Thank you for your consideration.	Richard Scarlett	12/22/2021
67.	LU Goals - The goals which pertain specifically Special use permits need to be strengthened to protect and preserve the character of the individual homeowner rights and values. A simple statement modifying the existing language to include guidance that special attention to preserving view lines, noise encroachment and privacy of neighboring homeowners need to be added.	Anonymous	12/22/2021
68.	LU Goals- I would not issue any more special use permits. They ruin our town. CC&H Goals- Acre only residential lots. No more small lots in the town. Ruins the character of our town. Mobility Goals- Keep our roads small and discourage cut thru traffic.	Anonymous	12/22/2021
69.	I object to the "select edits" to the land use plan allowing the 1/3 acre next to El Chorro Lodge to be changed from Low Density Residential to Resort/County club. It seems the developer received a shortcut. This decision/policy seems counter to Land Use Goals - Goal LU.1 Enhance Quality of Life and counter to Community Character and Housing Goal CC&H.1 Existing Residential Character	Anonymous	12/23/2021
70.	OS Goals- We need more non-motorized spaces. Bike lanes and sidewalks. Walking should be encouraged. Many us are force to walk in the street. Existing sidewalks that abut the curb do not feel that safe when vehicles are whizzing by at 40 mph. Please put some distance between pedestrians and vehicles. Overall -We need more sidewalks!! Any new construction should REQUIRE sidewalk frontage as part of issuing a building permit. Widen Casa Blanca Drive. Dangerous at times for pedestrians and cyclists ... especially when vehicles are coming from both directions.	Anonymous	12/24/2021
71.	LU Goals- I am concerned about what the "special use permit property" means and how this can be used. It doesn't seem clear. Mobility Goals- I want to make one pointThere is no in the goals about strengthening the bicycle network, and the pedestrian network as part of a holistic multi modal transportation or mobility strategy. It is still an automobile dominant set of goals and the existing road environment, is car dominant. I would like to encourage you to consider an idea of strengthening the bicycle and pedestrian networks, that would add value to the Paradise Valley community and quality of life. Where possible, introduce a new generation of bicycle lanes, where possible reduce width of vehicle lanes, where possible improve the sidewalks and walkability of the PV community. There are many areas that can be improved. I commend the plan, yet the mobility section could be more innovative regarding alternatives to the automobile. thank you very much for your	Anonymous	12/28/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

	<p>efforts to project a very positive vision for Paradise Valley in the near future. OS Goals- I think the open space section could emphasize land conservation, ecology, natural habitat, wildlife...a bit more Open space is more than visual...it supports the ecology of the place. Paradise Valley has a rich ecology due to the decades of desert landscape preservation and could celebrate this and tie it into the open space strategies and principles. One of the reasons we live here is that this community embraces the desert landscape and desert ecology. and it is reflected in the larger open space of the community. But this could be articulated in the next generation general plan. residents and resorts could both collaborate more on an desert ecology effort. Perhaps this could be a separate planning effort following the general plan? EPW Goals -add something on ecology, wildlife, habitat preservation efforts.</p>		
72.	<p>the number of hotel rooms has doubled. We don't need more! The Town needs a serious enforced noise level standard to lessen the loud music from hotels.</p>	Anonymous	12/30/2021
73.	<p>1-Prioritize residential neighborhoods over more resort development. (the full General Plan specifically states, "the development and redevelopment of development areas have been realized and the Town does not anticipate a large increase in non-residential development over the next 10-20 years") Do what you say. Do not permit yet another hotel by developing el Chorro. 2- Play fair- Do Not allow El Chorro to convert the small portion of its land over property that is zoned low density residential to Resort SUP. This is not a map clean up. It is letting El Chorro Developers change their zoning by circumventing the rules and procedures everyone else must follow. I don't support this because it is too vague to be meaningful. LU 1.5 of the land use provisions claims to discourage conversion of residential to non-residential, yet that exact thing is already being proposed for a small part of the El Chorro property. LU 3.1 claims a steadfast commitment to protect the Town's Low Density Character and Quality of Life. Yet most of this section is mostly about more resort development. The Noise, View interruptions and traffic are already out of control. More infill resort development can only worsen this situation. We don't need it!</p>	Anonymous	12/30/2021
74.	<p>1- Prioritize residential neighborhoods over more resort development. The full General Plan specifically states, "the development and redevelopment of development areas have been realized and the Town does not anticipate a large increase in non-residential development over the next 10-20 years "Do what you say. Do not permit yet another hotel by developing el Chorro. 2. Play fair. Do not allow El Chorro to convert the small portion of its property that is zoned low density residential to resort SUP. This is not a "map clean up". It is letting El Chorro developers change their zoning by circumventing the rules and procedures oeveryone else must follow. I don't support this because it is too vague to be meaningful. LU 1.5 of the land use provisions claims to discourage conversion of residential to non-residential, yet that exact thing is already being proposed for a small part of the El Chorro property. LU 3.1 claims a steadfast commitment to protect the Town's Low Density Character and Quality of Life. Yet most of this section is mostly about more resort development. The noise, view interruption and traffic are already out of control. We don't need it!</p>	Anonymous	12/30/2021
75.	<p>I have read and reread the Public Review draft of the 2022 General Plan. I think it is most confusing, so I am answering it by this letter instead of</p>	Brett A. Getz	12/30/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

	<p>your survey. I have lived in Paradise Valley for the past 70 years. I love it and hope that my family , some of whom are also residents of the town, will also enjoy it as much as I have, but they won't if the 2022 General Plan is passed as I read it. The basis on which the Town was founded was "a steadfast commitment to protect the Town's low-density character and quality of life." Now the proposal is about more resort development which is contrary to its founding. Specifically changing the zoning on part of the El Chorro property from single family to resort. That is insane. I have lived for over 20 years in Colonia Miramonte, the next-door neighbor, and the last thing needed is another 3 story resort totally surrounding a 70 year very quiet and peaceful residential community. The noise, view interruptions, and traffic are already out of control and more "infill resort development" can only make it worse. This plan would allow this to happen without going through the usual change in zoning requirements. I am not a complainer but enough is enough. This additional development contemplated, would be much easier under this plan and I object strenuously making that possible. I had fully planned to make my later years living in our planned community and not between 2 noisy and more congested resorts. This was not what Jack Stewart envisioned when he built Camelback Inn and Colonia Miramonte 70 years ago, and should not be allowed to happen now.</p>		
76.	<p>LU Goals- Safety within the TOPV should be primary goal. CC&H Goals- Add safety within the TOPV as a goal. Mobility Goals- Transit into and out of TOPV is not as important as is the safety and ease of mobility within the TOPV. OS Goals- Safety when enjoying the environment should be #1. Provide a great living environment but if one cannot enjoy it because one is "trapped" within one's home, then TOPV has failed. EPW Goals- Provide an even greater opportunity to enjoy the beauty of the TOPV. Other/Overall- Suggest: Place radar control at intersections to catch and ticket cyclists who fail to stop at stop signs or who fail to obey the rules of the road. Add solar powered stop sign lighting for East and West bound traffic at 56th and Doubletree intersection to decrease stop sign running at that intersection.</p>	Anonymous	12/30/2021
77.	<p>CC&H Goals- Adhere to the historic precedent of one acre per residence. Mobility Goals- Would like further information on the regional transit systems and need for resort connectors. OS Goals- How is the town addressing Air BNB/VRBO rentals.</p>	Anonymous	12/30/2021
78.	<p>CC&H Goals- Places to Connect. Barry Goldwater is enough and no new gathering places. Residents do not use only visitors. Mobility Goals- Regional Transit Services. Maintain the current bus system. Concerned about the language regarding Specialized connectors for resorts, residents. Residents drive everywhere and if resorts want to provide ride share for resort guests or employees they fund and operate that function. The town should not provide this service or be in the transportation business. OS Goals-Healthy Lifestyle goal. What is this? It is not up to the town of PV to provide a "healthy lifestyle" for residents or guests. This is a personal responsibility not a government function. Sustainability Goals- Only 2 goals of the town of PV: 1. Sustain our finances short and long term and 2. Sustain our supply of water short and long term. Remember PV residents want small government and no overreach into our personal lives. Other/Overall- Please remember that the majority of residents live here because of limited government, 1 acre min lots (low density) and quality of life. Considering the last 2 years, I</p>	Anonymous	12/31/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

	want less government in my life not more and do not want or need public officials intruding in my personal life.		
79.	<p>I've read your "Message from the Mayor" with great interest. While I have owned a home in PV since 2009, I became a full time resident in 2017, and could not have landed in a better community than Colonia Miramonte in the beautiful Town of Paradise Valley. I appreciate the work of the Planning Committee as it is difficult to balance low-density residential living with also being a world class resort destination. I also understand the associated economic benefits of the hospitality industry to our budget. However, I have a difficult time understanding the tradeoffs between the excessive growth of hotel rooms verses the best low-density living. I have to question your statement of "quiet surroundings". While the music stops around 10pm, does an ordinance to limit the decibel level of the music exist, and if so, is it enforced? Can anyone predict the traffic patterns if and when the hospitality industry recovers? At a minimum, can we table any new resort approvals until we experience the consequences of the newer developments? My simple analysis follows: The number of hotel rooms I have listed are subject to question as I sought several different sources and received several different answers. I expect that the exact data exists with the Planning Committee. This would seem to be an important, reportable statistic in your General Plan Update. THE OLD: Camelback - 462 rooms, Sanctuary - 118 Rooms, Total: 580. THE NEW: Omni - 293 rooms, Mountain Shadow - 254 rooms, Ritz - 200 to 300? rooms, Totals: 747 to 847. THE APPROVED: Andez - 201 rooms. THE UNKNOWN: Smoke Tree - ?. From my perspective the numbers speak for themselves. THE OLD: 580. THE NEW: 747 TO 847. APPROVED: 201. MY CONCLUSION: THE LAST THING WE NEED IS ANOTHER HOTEL!</p>	Tony Jacobs	12/31/2021
80.	<p>LU Goals- provide the importance of safety to those living in TOPV. Safety on the roadways from speeders, but also safety from MOSQUITOES so we can enjoy our environment. Join with Maricopa County Vector Control to stop mosquito breeding. Use COVID Federal Funds. Require Camelback Golf Course to stop mosquito breeding in the water logged areas of their golf course at Doubletree etc. Proactive spraying of the mosquito breeding sites. CC&H Goals- Why has our residential environment been allowed to be disrupted with neon signage at Cherokee School? OR maybe during the daylight hours, but STOP the NEON LIGHT SIGNAGE from dusk to dawn. TOPV is a welcome relief from the ever prevalent light pollution from metro Phoenix and now you allow NEON lights after dusk? NOT NECESSARY! STOP IT! Mobility Goals- The 56th and Doubletree intersection needs improvement to provide enhanced safety. Stop sign runner going E and W bound along Doubletree cause added danger at that intersection. Enhance mechanisms to attract the attention of E/W bound drivers along Doubletree that they MUST STOP at the intersection. Perhaps add solar powered flashing lights to the stop signs E/W bound traffic. OS Goals- Stop further encroachment of walls toward roadways. To increase the buildable acreage by moving walls further towards the roadway is NOT acceptable. We will become like so many residential environments where one drives down a roadway flanked by walls such that it appears on is driving down a narrow passage within a maze. NOT GOOD. EPW Goals- The TOPV is a quiet residential environment. Please control noise pollution which can degrade our living environment. That includes airplane noise from the regional airports as well as vehicular noise along our roadways. Sustainability Goals- Please</p>	Anonymous	12/31/2021

60-Day Review

Community Survey #2 Summary

	control the effects of building of walls and other structures across the many washes within our Town. When an owner builds a wall across a wash to encompass his/her land, it must be done in such a way that it does NOT impede the flow of water and drainage along that wash. Why? Because it causes backup of water upstream which in turn floods "upstream" properties. PSF Goals- Short term rentals are KILLING OUR TOWN's NATURE and QUALITY. PLEASE STOP STR's!!!! I have no problem with a couple or family renting a home for a few nights as part of a vacation. However, I HATE the concept of homes being rented for EVENTS such as weddings, etc. or GRADUATIONS, etc. STOP the use of STRs for PARTIES, or DRUG related events, or Sex related events, etc. Other/Overall- These questions are obtuse and designed to support your plans rather than to really determine what the residents of the TOPV think about individual items.		
81.	OS Goals- Manage open space for wildlife, not residents or tourists. EPW Goals- Reduce light pollution in addition to noise pollution. Sustainability Goals- Not in order of importance goal 6 should be #1 and goal 4 is #2. Other/Overall: The challenge is to preserve open space while still respecting private property rights. This survey should tell you how much residents expect the Town to do. Many will agree with me that the Town's role should remain very limited.	Anonymous	01/01/2022
82.	We are opposed to revising the El Chorro Property to Resort/Country Club. It violates LU6. Why was this approved without debate or public comment? The rules should apply to all and we object to a special shortcut for El Chorro developers. The Town's resort development goals have been fulfilled, and strongly prefer preserving our neighborhood's quality of life over building more large hotels.	Anonymous	01/03/2022
83.	Please add more sidewalks. We love to walk - walking in the street is hazardous. - Prefer sidewalks a little distance from the street for safety thank you. P.S. We love living here	Anonymous	1/4/2022

Conclusion

Based on the detailed public comments shared within this report, along with input and guidance provided by the Planning Commission and Town Council, select edits were incorporated into the General Plan in preparation for the formal public hearing process and ultimate voter ratification scheduled for August 2022.