

1 He said previously the building was zoned Business-Park (B-P). He said in considering
2 whether to approve the request for a CUP, the Planning Commission identifies impacts like
3 traffic and parking concerns and sets conditions to mitigate those impacts. Mr. Snyder said, in his
4 opinion, the most significant issue affecting this CUP is parking. He explained that the City's
5 Zoning Code expects all parking to be handled on-site, but in this case, there is not adequate on-
6 site parking for the planned use. He said the applicant plans to reconfigure a loading dock area
7 into a few parking spaces, but that will still not satisfy the parking requirement for the
8 approximately 10,500 square foot building.
9

10 Mr. Snyder said the lack of on-site parking is a Site Plan issue, not a CUP issue. He
11 recommends the Planning Commission table the application at this time and allow the applicant
12 to come back with a more complete analysis and application (Criterion 5) for off-site parking.
13 Mr. Snyder recommended the applicant submit an amended Site Plan so Staff can analyze and
14 establish findings.
15

16 Commissioner Daly asked for a clarification on the difference between using gross square
17 footage or fixed seating to determine parking requirements. Mr. Snyder said gross square
18 footage is one parking stall per 100 square feet of building space. He said in fixed seating or
19 bench seating, 20 inches is considered one seat, and for every six of those you need one parking
20 stall.
21

22 Commissioner Wright asked Staff if tabling is necessary since the applicant has secured
23 agreements for off-site parking. Mr. Snyder said yes because Staff does not have the information
24 necessary to prepare the findings and conditions that would support approval.
25

26 Chair Hirschi asked what specifically is missing from the application and Mr. Snyder
27 answered the justification for off-site parking is missing. Chair Hirschi asked Mr. Snyder to
28 confirm that a Site Plan is needed in order for Staff to complete a parking analysis and Mr.
29 Snyder said yes.
30

31 City Attorney Lisa Romney said shared parking agreements can be problematic and
32 sometimes require enforcement. She said the shared parking agreements submitted by the
33 applicant are not complete because they need to be recorded and a parking modification may also
34 be required. She said the applicant's need for additional parking cannot be satisfied with street
35 parking. She said the applicant must provide parking for the entire building, not just the portion
36 they are using.
37

38 Commissioner Daly said he was concerned about putting undue requirements on the
39 applicant. He specifically asked for a clarification on parking codes 12.52.070 and 12.52.110.
40 Ms. Romney said Staff needs to analyze parking codes 070 and 110 to interpret how they impact
41 this application.
42

43 At 7:43 p.m., Chair Hirschi turned the time over to the applicant. Loren Pankratz, the
44 Pastor at Bridge Community Church, said they will be using about 3300 square feet of space
45 from the approximately 10,500 square foot building. He said he and other parishioners have
46 secured agreements for up to 75 additional parking spaces from adjacent neighbors. He said he
47 thought he had covered everything that was required in Criterion 5. After hearing the
48 Commissioners' and Staff's concerns about parking, Mr. Pankratz said in order to avoid the

1 additional time required for an amended Site Plan review, he thinks the existing 21 parking
2 spaces would be sufficient. He said they are willing to go back to the 1997 site plan
3 requirements. He clarified that his application did not request approval for street parking. He
4 said he thought his application had covered all the requirements for off-site parking.
5

6 In response to a question from Commissioner Wright, Mr. Pankratz said the church has
7 Sunday morning meetings at 9:15 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. and they generally have about 200
8 congregants split between those meetings.
9

10 Chair Hirschi opened the public hearing at 7:53 p.m.
11

12 Mr. McIntyre from Centerville said he did not think the off-site parking application
13 should be approved until the submission is revised with exact numbers instead of estimates.
14

15 Marshall (no last name given) asked for clarification on the term "shared" parking,
16 specifically inquiring if it included a timing element since the church would be using the parking
17 spaces on Sundays while other businesses use it during the week. City Attorney Lisa Romney
18 said "shared" means a parking lot that is used by two businesses regardless of the time.
19

20 Seeing no one else wishing to comment, Chair Hirschi closed the public hearing at 7:57
21 p.m. and turned the time over to the Commissioners and Staff for discussion.
22

23 Commissioner Hayman asked Staff if the applicant could return to the 1997 zoning
24 requirements and Mr. Snyder said yes. Commissioner Hayman said she understands that the
25 applicant wants to move forward with the project, but she also understands Staff's need to review
26 a Site Plan. Mr. Snyder said the Commissioners could disagree with Staff's recommendation to
27 table the application, but he did not think the Commissioners had the findings or conditions to
28 approve the CUP application. Commissioner Hayman followed-up with a question about how a
29 Site Plan review would affect the timing of the application. Mr. Snyder said an amended Site
30 Plan review is a two-step process before the Planning Commission. Step 1 is a Conceptual Site
31 Plan, including the parking application, which generally takes three weeks to get on the
32 Commission's agenda. Step 2 is a Final Site Plan and that could take an additional three weeks.
33

34 Chair Hirschi asked Mr. Snyder to confirm that the CUP application could be considered
35 at the same time as the Final Site Plan and Mr. Snyder said yes.
36

37 In response to a question from Commissioner Wright about shared parking agreements,
38 City Attorney Lisa Romney said she agrees with Director Snyder that Staff needs time to analyze
39 City code numbers 12.52.070 and 12.52.110 to interpret how they relate to this project. Ms.
40 Romney repeated Mr. Snyder's analysis that City code says the applicant has to accommodate all
41 parking on site. She said if that is not possible, the applicant can request a permit for off-site
42 parking, shared parking or a parking modification. She said she agrees with Staff's
43 recommendation to table for further review.
44

45 Seeing someone wanting to speak, Chair Hirschi asked for a motion to re-open the public
46 hearing at 8:12 p.m. Commissioner Daly made a **MOTION** to re-open the public hearing.
47 Commissioner Hayman seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (6-0).
48

1 Russell Martin said that Pastor Pankratz has already said the church is willing to go back
2 to the original 21 spaces. He said it is important that they continue to make progress on closing
3 with the seller of the building and he does not want to go through an 8-week process. He said
4 they can come back before the Planning Commission at a later date to address the additional
5 parking modifications, and he asked for workability.

6
7 Mr. Pankratz said they would like to close on the building in early June. He asked the
8 Planning Commission to approve the CUP with a condition about parking so that they could
9 move forward with the seller.

10
11 TJ Gale asked if a change in the wording of the shared parking agreements, from a 30-
12 day termination to a 6-month termination, for example, would make any difference.

13
14 Seeing no one else wishing to comment, Chair Hirschi closed the re-opened public
15 hearing at 8:18 p.m. Chair Hirschi responded to TJ Gale's question and said, under the
16 circumstances, changing from a 30-day to a 6-month termination would not make a difference.

17
18 Commissioner Wright asked Staff to explain to the applicant how a CUP applies to the
19 entire property and not just the space the applicant is using. Mr. Snyder said the CUP is a long-
20 term approval that runs with the land and the entire building, not a portion. He recommended the
21 applicant return with a Conceptual Site Plan, and then at a later date, the Planning Commission
22 could consider a Final Site Plan and the CUP.

23
24 Commissioner Johnson said if it is our duty to interpret ordinances and apply it to the
25 application before us, it seems a stretch to make it happen tonight. He told the applicant that a
26 table is not a denial and the process is still underway.

27
28 Commissioner Hayman asked Staff to provide further guidance to the applicant on what was
29 needed to satisfy Criterion 5. Mr. Snyder said his focus is to zero in on the required number of
30 parking spaces, the details about the off-site or shared parking spaces, and the travel pattern,
31 including:

- 32
33 • Determine the actual number of parking spaces required
34 • Determine whether to calculate parking using fixed seating, gross square footage, general
35 assembly or hybrid portable seating
36 • Eliminate double counting
37 • Identify parking layout, circulation, exits and dimensions
38 • Determine the square footage of the building
39 • Change the 13-foot turnaround to a 15-foot turnaround
40 • Use the 1997 zoning standards instead of the current standards
41 • Determine what happens if shared parking agreements are terminated
42 • Determine if the project is suitable for surrounding neighbors
43 • Analyze justification for off-site parking
44 • Prepare parking modification and analyze parking striping
45 • Determine if shared parking agreements need to be recorded
46 • Select 45 or 60 degree parking angle
47 • Analyze need for crosswalks for pedestrians

Commissioner Hayman made a **MOTION** for the Planning Commission to table the conditional use permit for The Bridge Community Church Use, subject to the conditions (1-4) from the Staff Report. Commissioner Helgesen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (6-0).

CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant must submit an "Amended Site Plan" Application to determine whether the loading area reconfiguration and new circulation pattern complies with applicable ordinance regulations (see CZC 12.21(i)). Also, for the information of the applicant, a site plan amendment is a two (2) step process consisting of Conceptual Site Plan and Final Site Plan, which may not be combined into one submittal (see CZC 12.21.110(c)(1)).
2. As part of the Amended Site Plan submittal, the applicant needs to request and provide the necessary information for obtaining an "Off-site Parking Approval" from the Planning Commission (see CZC 12.53.070(b)). More particularly, the applicant shall also address in writing the elements of Criterion 5.
3. As part of the request for off-site parking, the applicant is to obtain, in writing, recommendations from the Public Works Director, City Engineer, and the Police Chief regarding the viability of using local streets for off-site parking purposes to satisfy the required parking standards and more specifically the use of 1250 West (an arterial street).
4. With the loading areas being reconfigured for parking, as part of the amended site plan submittal the applicant is to address whether the doors are to remain operational or be removed and the space be filled in with other materials or glass windows.

PAGES LANE PUBLIC FORUM STAFF REPORT AND ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION ON THE RESULTS OF THE SUBMITTED SURVEYS, COMMENTS, AND FEEDBACK FROM THE MAY 10 PAGES LANE PUBLIC FORUM.

City Planner Younger reported on input from the public forum held on May 10 regarding future development of the Pages Lane commercial area. In summary, she said the public indicated favor toward a grocery store or a park, and indicated hesitancy toward residential development.

She said the majority of comments indicate the public is open to another grocery store like the previous Dick's Market. She said there may be some hope for a grocery store, but generally, Staff does not agree that a typical grocery store is part of the long-term vision. Mr. Snyder added that the old Dick's Market facility is too large a building to attract a small niche grocery store.

Ms. Younger said 30 surveys were submitted, with only a limited number of respondents answering yes to residential development, and a few associated comments indicating a preference for single-family homes with quarter-acre lots. She said in the section of the survey that asked what they would hate, respondents answered apartments or high-density housing. She said the comments on the Brighton Homes proposal were not favorable, and that comments indicated it was too dense or crowded. She said the public comments indicated very little interest in mixed-use style buildings. She said there were favorable comments about green space, parks or a cemetery. She said she sensed a strong public sentiment for a park.

Mr. Snyder talked about the differences between planning for something immediate (within 5 years) or long-term. He said in the short-term he thought the Brighton Homes proposal had potential because of the current housing market. He said a residential development has to provide 40% open space. He said in 10 or 15 years, the market may be geared more toward apartments. He thinks commercial in that space is going to be weak for a long while.

Mr. Snyder said a recreation, arts and parks (RAP) tax should be considered. He wondered if there is an appetite to partner with a developer, although he said the City would need to find a developer who is willing to look at a longer timeline. Mr. Snyder said Staff needs direction from the Planning Commission before they draft language for the General Plan.

Chair Hirschi suggested a work session to review the public input, formulate ideas, and give direction to Staff. He said he would like to give more consideration to a public-private partnership that may take into consideration the entire block. He said there are stakeholders on the block that did not participate in the forum and he wants to hear from them.

Commissioner Wright agreed and said it would be out-of-place to do piecemeal development, putting residential in the middle of two commercial districts. Commissioner Wright would like to consider the RAP tax, park impact fees and other alternatives to see what is required.

Chair Hirschi asked for input from the Commissioners on whether they meet with the other stakeholders before the work session. Commissioner Daly suggested a work session first, and then meet with the stakeholders.

Chair Hirschi made a **MOTION** to hold a work session at 5:30 p.m. prior to the next Planning Commission meeting on Wednesday, June 14. Commissioner Wright seconded the motion and it passed unanimously (6-0).

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

City Planner Younger said there are four items on the agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting, including an application for a Preliminary Subdivision.

CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS REPORT


- Cottage on the Corner Rezone – Council Approved
- Agricultural Low Setbacks – Council Tabled to next meeting
- Lund Lane Rezone (Higley) – Petition Withdrawn

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hayman made a **MOTION** to adjourn. Commissioner Daly seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0). The meeting adjourned at 9:11 p.m.



David Hirschi, Chairman



Luanne Hudson, Recording Secretary

6-14-2017

Date Approved

